THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I. AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1921. Nos. 8 & 9.

The Vatican and Diplomatic Relationships.

PROF. TH. GRAEBNER, St. Louis, Mo.

There are at present thirty-one countries represented by embassies and legations at the Vatican, and the *New World* (Chicago, Roman Catholic) boasts that "the diplomatic influence of the Holy See is the greatest in the history of the Church" — a statement which can only refer to the extension of these diplomatic relationships and not to the exercise of actual temporal power involved. However, it must be conceded that the Curia has scored heavily during the political upheavals consequent upon the war. When France renews relations with the Vatican, — as now seems certain, — Italy alone, of all the principal countries of Europe, will be without a representative accredited to the Papal Court. A Catholic News Service dispatch of April 1 says: —

"The Vatican is in diplomatic relations not only with all of the great Catholic countries and most of the principal Protestant states of Europe, but has established at least semiofficial intercourse with Turkey, Japan, and China. All of the states which have arisen since the war — Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and Jugo-Slavia — have exchanged diplomatic representatives with the Holy See. Every country in South America, most of the Central American republics, and Haiti and San Domingo have legations at the Vatican. Canada is represented by Great Britain, whose temporary representative has been made permanent."

The British envoy was sent to the Vatican five years ago on a mission which was intended to be "strictly temporary," its object being "to congratulate the Pope on his election [!] and to keep him informed respecting British policy during the war," as the press announcements read at the time. When no longer needed for this purpose, the representation was to come to an end. But it is two years and a half since the war ended, and the envoy is still at

the Vatican. British opinion was never favorable to this move, which was made without the authorization of Parliament, and protests have recently been heard which call for a cessation of these official relations. The *Churchman's Magazine* says that the situation is "entirely contrary to the democratic principles which are supposed to prevail in Great Britain," and continues: —

"Moreover, the Prime Minister was recently asked about the matter in the House of Commons, and he affirmed that this unconstitutional traffic with the papacy would be maintained. He also intimated that in his judgment the mission had the approval of the nation.

"To convince the Prime Minister that this is not so, the United Protestant Council is making an appeal for the signatures of loyal British subjects to a petition for the withdrawal of the envoy, and for the following, among other reasons:

"1. Because it is contrary to the Constitution of this Realm as expressed in the Bill of Rights that the Sovereign shall hold communion with the Pope of Rome.

"2. Because the envoy is himself a Roman Catholic, and is therefore bound to place the policy of the Roman Curia above the interests of Great Britain.

"3. Because he has accomplished nothing for the political welfare of this country.

"4. Because, on the contrary, during the time that this envoy has been supposed to be influencing the Pope on behalf of England, the Pope's agents — bishops, priests, and people — have been displaying hatred of Britain, and working for her injury in Ireland, Canada, Australia, and wherever else they had the power.

"5. Because at a critical period of the war the interference of the envoy caused serious trouble, which embarrassed our relations with France, put us in a false position in the eyes of Germany, and might have had fatal consequences.

"6. Because by maintaining this mission our Government recognizes the false claims and pretensions of the papacy, gives a favored position to the Romish system which it accords to no other religion, and thereby deliberately insults the loyal Protestants of the whole empire."

The five new countries to exchange diplomatic representatives with the Vatican are Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Switzerland, Roumania, and Jugo-Slavia. In addition the legations of Peru, Chili, Brazil, and Prussia were raised to the rank of embassies. The representative from Prussia has the title of German Ambassador to the Vatican. The five countries which now have diplomatic representatives at the Vatican with the rank of ambassador are Peru, Chili, Prussia, Brazil, and Spain. The other countries represented with ministers are Argentina, Austria, Bavaria, Belgium, Bolivia, Columbia, Costa Rica, Czecho-Slovakia, Ecuador, Germany, Great Britain, Haiti, Honduras, Monaco, Nicaragua,

Holland, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, San Domingo, San Salvador, Jugo-Slavia, Hungary, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Each of the appointments was heralded to the American public by special cable. The following is a characteristic dispatch of the N. C. W. C. (Roman Catholic) news services: —

"EUROPE'S DIPLOMATS GATHER AT VATICAN.

"Rome, August 1. — Two more have been added to the long list of ministers accredited to the Vatican: Count Somszich, the first Hungarian minister to the Holy See, recently appointed, was received Monday; and Dr. Jonescu, the new representative from Roumania, was received in formal audience on Thursday, when he presented his credentials. There was the usual ceremonial and private conversation with the Holy Father, after which Dr. Jonescu visited Cardinal Gasparri, Secretary of State, and then went to St. Peter's to venerate the Tomb of the Apostles.

"Monsignor Natale Gabriel Moriondo, O. P., Bishop of Cuneo, has been named apostolic visitor to the new republic of Georgia, and departs about the middle of August for Tiflis, where he will reside. Monsignor Moriondo was formerly superior of the Dominican mission in Constantinople, and was consecrated in that city on July 5, 1914."

The New World, August 13, 1920.

The successes of Vatican politics in Poland were frequently set forth in Roman Catholic cable letters, the good news culminating in a dispatch of February 6 (1921), which stated that the Polish diet had adopted on that date a resolution prescribing for the Polish president two qualifications — he must be a native of Poland, and he must be a Roman Catholic. In a letter to the *Lutheran* (Philadelphia), Rev. Dr. J. A. Morehead, commissioner of the National Lutheran Council in Europe, wrote (May 5, 1921): —

"When Poland came to adopt a constitution, articles were proposed which indicate the policy of the Vatican where it has the power. We go into details concerning the situation in order to set before our readers in specific form the present-day Roman doctrines of temporal supremacy. In America our religious liberty would not last long if an opportunity to restrict its present privileges is given.

"In the constitution of the Polish state — heretofore merely a project — the two articles referring to the Church read as follows: 'Art. 117. The Roman Catholic Church, to which the majority of the population of Poland belongs, takes the first place. She rules by her own laws. The relation between this Church and the state is consolidated by a Concordate with the Pope. Art. 118. The question of the relation between the other confessions and the state will be settled by a statute law after hearing the suggestions of the different delegates.'

"The leader of the Roman Catholic party is a papal fanatic, who gives his views of the Protestant churches as follows: 'The Protestant "so-called" churches are "church unions," which are compelled to submit

their statutes to the minister for registration. The Roman Catholic Church alone is a Church in the full sense of the word, and has its own legislation.'"

Dr. Morehead believes that the Protestant world should be thoroughly awake to the present activity of the Vatican's representatives among the various states. "Their success in Europe will embolden them everywhere, and Protestant America will be confronted the sooner with a class problem of unparalleled proportion, unless something is done to support the liberties of religious minorities in Europe."

The *Lutheran* editorially, in commenting on this letter of Dr. Morehead's, points out the method consistently followed by the Roman Curia during the after-war period: "Finding certain states in the throes of revolution, where a very small help or hindrance will determine national permanency or destruction, the representatives of the Vatican make the best bargain they can — not for the individual constituencies of the people, nor for the interests and desires of the state, but for the power of Rome as a great ecclesiastical empire."

The increase of political power which the Pope gained in Germany during the war and after is a case in point. The Vatican has had a nuncio in Munich since 1785. A second nunciature was established at Berlin last year. A clear-visioned writer in the *Reichsbote* (Dr. W. Dreising) makes this comment (June 18): —

"And what does this nuncio signify? In plain words, the nunciature means an absolute supervision (*Beaufsichtigung*) of Germany by Rome. No political measures that even remotely affect the interests of Catholics will hereafter be taken without the *placet* of the Pope. Of course, Rome is too shrewd to give and withhold publicly its opinions, but the fact remains as stated. And the worst of it is that the Roman censorship will insensibly be extended to German liberty, German law, German scholarship, while the Evangelical Church will be reduced to the *niveau* of a sect. Incredible though it may seem, I have received from Evangelical clergymen, to whom I expressed these fears, the answer: 'The nuncio, — oh, we shall get rid of him again!' Really? Oh, how little these people know Rome! What rivers of blood flowed during the Thirty Years' War that we might get rid of Rome, — and in vain. No, our poor fatherland will never again be delivered from the nuncio and the terrible hand of Rome. We lost the World War May 15" (the date of the nuncio's appointment to Berlin). "Everything imposed upon us by the Entente can be restored, repaired, though it take a century; but the establishment of the nunciature can never be redeemed."

As a matter of fact, these papal legations in Protestant countries have, since the Reformation, been termed Missionary Nun-

ciatures, their object being the restoration of Roman ascendancy. In Bohemia and Poland this work was very thoroughly done, and the establishment of the office in Munich was the reply of the Vatican to the attempts made by Bishop Hontheim of Treves and of the Congress of Ems to establish a national Catholic Church for Germany.

In the United States, the efforts of the hierarchy to worm itself into a quasi-official relation to the National Government have in recent decades been crowned with considerable success. We have had field-masses, with official representation of the military, we have had the Pan-American Mass on Thanksgiving Day, and the annual recurrence of New Year receptions of Cardinal Gibbons at Washington. To this latter affair the name "Cardinal's Day" has been quite generally applied. Some years ago the *Christian Herald* contained an article by Prof. Dau commenting on Cardinal's Day, which stated the Protestant attitude over against this institution so excellently that we cannot, in this connection, forbear quoting from it. The salient portion of this article reads: —

"Now here comes the oldest American cardinal, oldest in years and office, and sets up his own New Year reception at our capital, and is delighted to see that in a manner his claim to recognition as a sovereign, 'a prince of the blood,' is granted; for some persons of official rank are there to greet him. They may persuade themselves, but they will not persuade millions of their fellow-citizens, that they came merely to greet a kind old gentleman or a personal friend, or to honor a great man. Mr. Gibbons has come to Washington not as Mr. Gibbons, but as the leading prelate of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. He and his people have noticed the presence at their 'Cardinal's Day' not of Mr. A., but Cabinet Member A.; not of Mr. B., but Ambassador B.; not of Mr. C., but of Justice of the Supreme Court C.; not of Mr. D., but of General D.; not of Mr. E., but of Admiral E.; not of Mr. F., but of Senator F.,; not of Mr. G., but of Representative G., etc. None of these gentlemen, we imagine, would have gone to Baltimore to attend Cardinal's Day; therefore the accommodating Cardinal comes to Washington. The prophet has not risked calling the mountain to him, and has discreetly elected to go to the mountain. Moreover, this is preferable, because Baltimore is not the capital, while Washington is.

"Our officials and statesmen have our sympathy if they must attend these functions. If they imagine that their presence on Cardinal's Day or at a Pan-American mass is for any other purpose than stage effect and Catholic *renommée*, and that by far the greater portion of their intelligent and fair-minded fellow-citizens view their action in any other light, they are mistaken. Nor will the hue and cry about Protestant bigotry, violation of personal liberty, unwarranted constraint, and all that sort of thing, which is raised by Catholic papers and reechoed by a servile press whenever some one criticizes these sinister acts of the Roman hierarchy, deceive

any one who has watched the trend of Roman Catholic ambition in our country. It is not the critics of these affairs that are trying to constrain any one, or else we shall have to find unwarranted constraint in our Constitution. If there is any real constraint attempted in this matter, it must come from the other side."

Now, every encroachment of the Roman hierarchy in this country upon the forbidden ground of politics has had but one ulterior aim — the recognition of the Pope as a temporal ruler. Stone has been laid upon stone in the arch, of which a papal legation at Washington is to be the keystone. And it seems as if the present is deemed the acceptable time. A "closer union" between this Government and the head of the "great body of Catholicism" is being advocated. National interests are pleaded for American representation at the Vatican. President Harding has been "sounded." Mr. Egan, ex-minister of the United States to Denmark, "may be America's first minister to the Vatican." We are quoting from Associated Press dispatches. Catholic expressions, both in the official press and from the public rostrum, pointing out the advantages which will accrue to America from such an arrangement, have multiplied of late. Much is made of England's representation at Rome, as evidence that even its "Protestant bias" could not prevent Great Britain from recognizing the fact that "the Vatican is the world's greatest religious and moral influence." (*America,* a Jesuit weekly.) The National Catholic Welfare Council has sent out a dispatch bearing on the possibility of Washington's being the meeting-place of an international congress which is to discuss an "association of nations." Accepting this report as true, the dispatch says: —

"From this point of view the position of the Pope is one of commanding importance, and his approval of an association of nations which is to direct by moral rather than military force international activities would have great weight. And if the United States is to take the lead in the formulation of the broad general principles upon which the proposed association of nations is to be founded, the assumption is that exchanges of views between the President and the Vatican would be facilitated by the appointment of an American Minister to the Holy See without in any way transgressing upon the American ideal of complete separation of Church and State. The action of France has already pointed the way."

The Apostolic Delegate himself, John Bonzano, in a speech delivered at Quigley Preparatory Seminary, Chicago, last year, said: —

"And not the multitudes only are looking to the Pope for assistance; the rulers of the earth are beginning to see that without his aid they are

powerless in face of the present situation. They are at last giving heed to the call of the Psalmist: *'Et nunc, reges, intelligite; erudimini, qui judicatis terram.*"

"The heads of the new nations — those which have come into existence through the great upheaval — are seeking to establish relations with the Holy See. For even at the birth of their national organization they are wise enough to understand that they need the influence of the Holy Father if they are to live and prosper.

"But the older nations also are coming to see the light; they have learned through the bitter experience of war what they had forgotten in the pleasant days of peace. They acknowledge that there can be no thorough restoration of order and no permanent security of peace except through the cooperation of him who represents on earth the Prince of Peace."

In this way the Catholic masses are prepared to give, when the opportune moment comes, the weight of their numbers to the demand that diplomatic relations be established between the White House and the Vatican.

While evidently ready to support a new understanding between nations, such as the Republican platform calls for, the hierarchy has by no means remitted its efforts to employ the League of Nations (of the Versailles peace) as a leverage to obtain for the papacy recognition as a sovereign state. The partiality of the Roman See for this union of *entente* nations was very evident from its first organization. When the Italian delegates withdrew from the Peace Conference while the foundations for the League were being laid, the Vatican was "deeply concerned" (press dispatch from Rome, April 24, 1919). The interest which the hierarchy has in the League was set forth in 1920 by Senator Sherman of Illinois, who gave a warning that the League of Nations may end the separation of Church and State and bring the civilized world under the dominance of the Vatican. The Senator said: —

"From an early age the occupants of the Vatican have believed in the inherent right of papal authority to administer civil government, and I fail to find recorded in the course of papal claims of later dates any renunciation or disavowal of the doctrine.

"Of the original 32 nations signatory to the proposed league, 28 are Christian; 17 are Catholic nations, and 11 are Protestant.

"The sway over these people, their implicit faith in the infallibility of the head of this great religious organization, is supreme. I cheerfully bear witness to its steady opposition to a socialistic state, disorder, and Bolshevism. But the head of the Church proclaims and teaches his infallibility.

"Shall the United States commit itself to the mercy of a power from which our ancestors delivered us?

"The Vatican is a most earnest advocate of the covenant of the League of Nations. On March 16, 1919, President Wilson conferred with the Vatican at Rome. The Pope among other things said, referring to the League of Nations: 'President Wilson put the matter so clearly that my doubts began to melt, and before our interview closed, I agreed with him on the main outlines of his plan.'"

Then adds the Senator ironically: "Miraculous conversion of the deep traditional wisdom of the Holy See!"

As recently as March 11, 1921, the *New World* of Chicago (Catholic) brought an inspired message from Geneva, dated February 25, to this effect: —

"The *Courier de Geneve* of February 5, 1921, publishes a letter sent last December by the Nuncio at Berne to the President of the Swiss Confederation with regard to the intervention of the League of Nations in favor of the Christians of Cilicia. The paper sees in this step an act of official recognition and approval of the League of Nations by the Holy See, and believes that this attitude of Benedict XV will be an encouragement to all Catholics to give it their support.

"The paper regrets that the Holy See was not invited at the very beginning to form part of the League of Nations and that it has no representative there, and expresses the hope that the heads of the League finally will realize the error committed in excluding from the new organization an authority which enjoys such universal consideration and veneration as the Pope."

The Roman Curia has scored heavily since August 2, 1914. Not since pre-Reformation days has it been permitted to surround itself with so many representatives of the nations. There is, indeed, a fly in the ointment. These ambassadors and ministers represent, at least in great part, countries which have with the expenditure of much blood and treasure purchased religious freedom, but, then, the memory of men is short, and — does not the League of Nations, or some other association of nations hold out to the Curia a promise of obtaining, by a skilful balance of national hatreds, fears, and jealousies, that which cannot be gained by direct influence on peoples and governments? And is there not a possibility that even the League is a means which will only temporarily be utilized as a leverage, and that in the recesses of the palace on Mons Vaticanus plans are being laid for world-conquest through new wars and revolutions?

Dr. Jaeger of Bethel in the Bielefelder weekly *Licht und Leben* has uttered some prognostications on this point which are worthy of our attention. The Evangelical house of Hohenzollern, Dr. Jaeger reminds us, has been excluded by the League from the throne of Germany, and this exclusion is to be a permanent one.

On the other hand, nothing is said in the treaty which would prevent the Catholic house of Hapsburg from mounting that throne, or the throne of a Germany united with Austria. Dr. Jaeger then continues: —

"A Catholic Germany under Hapsburg rule would constitute a nucleus for a Europe constituted on new lines. In the East there would be the State of Greater Poland, consisting of Posen, West Prussia, East Prussia, Lithuania, White Russia, and Galicia. This Greater Poland is to be ruled by another Hapsburger, Archduke Stephen. Its actual ruler would, of course, be the (Polish) Jesuit General, Ledochowsky. There is even now a movement looking to the reestablishment of the old Austrian monarchy. The *Petrusblaetter* and *Koelnische Volkszeitung* have suggested that Lower Austria with Vienna would be the economic nucleus for a union of the Danube countries, *i. e.*, of Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Roumania, and the Croat-Slovenian state. The population of this new bloc would be preponderatingly Catholic, Roumania at least under a Catholic dynasty. This Donaubund, too, is to have its Hapsburgian head, at Vienna. In France a restoration of diplomatic relations with the Vatican is hoped for. The great French generals, Foch, Joffre, Castelnau, have received their training in Jesuit schools. The house of Bourbon is closely related to Hapsburg, Empress Zita being herself a Bourbon. There is here the possibility of a Catholic monarchy of the West. Belgium is thoroughly clerical, so far as it is not socialistic. A Catholic restoration in France would inevitably result in a similar change in Italy. In Spain there is even now a Hapsburger scion on the throne. *A United States of Europe under papal dominion*, that is the possibility which the League of Nations convention in Switzerland has revealed to us. But the papal aspirations are not limited to a European league. Beyond the seas, in South and Central America, a complex of states, Spanish-Portuguese in language, Catholic in religion, is rapidly coming to the front. Through papal mediation, the leading states, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, have formed the so-called ABC union. Papal diplomacy is now endeavoring to extend this organization so as to include all South American states, and this solid bloc, the so-called Latin Union, which will extend to the southern boundaries of the North American states, will not fail to maintain some kind of organic relation to the European. From South America the threads run over to Japan, and quite recently the Vatican has greatly strengthened its relations to the Near East, — relations which may exercise a deciding influence in a coming conflict of the Catholic League with the Anglo-Saxon world. World-wide, bold schemes, maintained through every change and accident, and approaching their realization! Will the Anglo-Saxon nations succeed in opposing them? Will a world-wide revolution bring them to ruin? God knows. His will be the decision."

The *Freikirche,* from which we have translated Dr. Jaeger's paragraph, adds the comment: "These prognostications are, it is true, based only on supposition. But, for all that, they must not be dismissed by a wave of the hand. The Pope is pursuing his

plans with iron will and unremitting persistence. And he has his obedient servants in every part of the world, — more than two hundred million."

That world-dominion is the hope of the Vatican, who can doubt? What will be the outcome? God knows, — His will be the decision. But we would add, — He has decided. If we read Scripture and history aright, Antichrist was forever dethroned through the work of Martin Luther. Never again will he be able to crush out the light of the Gospel — for this is his aim, and temporal dominion only a means. Never again will he tyrannize over the body of the Christian Church. But what contests must be fought that our Evangelical liberties may be preserved, what rivers of blood may flow before the plottings against the Lord and His Church will be defeated — who can tell? *Das Reich muss uns doch bleiben.*

The Reestablishment of the Christian Church in Germany.[1]

Prof. J. T. Mueller, St. Louis, Mo.

It is with a feeling of deep commiseration that one peruses the six brochures mentioned below. As we laid them aside, we were reminded of a scene which once left an equally painful impression on our mind. It was in a sanitarium, and more particularly, in a ward arranged for those who were writhing in the dreadful final stage of tuberculosis. Through the narrow aisles we passed, between beds and cots, amid groaning and gasping, and endless hacking and flowing of blood, which the nurses tried in vain to check, until we came to the bedside of a young sufferer — a lad from "over there," where in trenches and shell-holes and by ceaseless exposure he had contracted the disease which now had wasted his strength. There was little that he could say between fits of coughing and spitting of blood, but what we understood was this: "Oh, pastor, I am gaining strength. I sleep better, and I am having a better appetite; *and now a friend has sent me some medicine, which the boys slipped through to me, and they say that medicine will cure any case of tuberculosis.*" In spite of this

1) *Wie verfassen wir die Kirche ihrem Wesen entsprechend? Die staatsfreie Volkskirche. Was nun? Eine christlich-deutsche Zeitbetrachtung.* Von Dr. Theo. Kaftan. *Von Innen nach Aussen.* Von Dr. Ph. Bachmann. *Ecclesiola in Ecclesia.* Von Dr. Gerh. Hilbert. *Die babylonische Verwirrung.* Von Herb. Brakebusch.

apodictic assertion the writer broke to him the bread of life as to one just about to set out on his last, far journey. And during that night the young soldier boy died.

The writers of the above-named pamphlets have led us through the ward of suffering, pain, and hopelessness. We should never have believed that the trouble could be so great, the sickness so quite unto death, and the case of the patient so distressingly hopeless. But it must be so. It cannot be otherwise. Pastor Brakebusch, in his *Die Babylonische Verwirrung,* has depicted the situation so graphically, and adduced evidence so overwhelming, that there can be no room for doubt. On page 44 he sums up the matter thus: "If the common man may, without fear, allow year after year to pass by without ever troubling himself about any Sunday or holiday, but rather employ these days for sleeping, working, traveling, or idling away his time foolishly while divine services are being held, then all this is the upshot of that pitiful inefficiency of a church that no longer knows what to do with her people, which has used up her powder, and does not understand or know what to do or desire, or for what purpose she is in the world; otherwise she would terminate such an insipid, silly, and reprehensible nuisance with a clap of thunder. Surely the salt has lost its savor!" [2] On page 45 he says: "I certainly have no desire to wade in this abominable slough any farther; however, I hope that I may have helped in showing that with our most wretched Babylonian confusion we are facing, at this time, a deluge which threatens to inundate the Church even more than the State." [3]

This is the indictment, not of an erratic superhypochondriac, but of an earnest pastor, who, halting at the brink of the enormous ecclesiastical cesspool of unbelief, wickedness, and corruption,

---

2) "Erlaubt sich der Buergersmann, ohne jedes Bedenken sich jahraus, jahrein um keinen Sonntag und Festtag mehr zu scheren, dann an diesen Tagen zu schlafen, dann zu arbeiten, dann zu reisen und dann umherzufaulenzen, wenn Gottesdienst gehalten wird, so ist das eben die Folge einer bloeden Unfaehigkeit der Kirche, die mit den Leuten nichts mehr anzufangen weiss, die ihr elendes Pulver verschossen hat, nicht mehr begreift und weiss, was sie soll und will und wozu sie da ist; andernfalls wuerde sie verstehen, ein gehoeriges Donnerwetter hinter ein so fades, dummes und schimpfliches Treiben zu machen. Wahrhaftig, das Salz ist dumm geworden."

3) "Ich will nicht weiter und tiefer in diesem gottsjaemmerlichen Sumpfe waten, hoffe aber zu der Einsicht verholfen zu haben, dass wir mit unserer schaudervollen babylonischen Verwirrung zu dieser Zeit kirchlich noch mehr als politisch vor einer hereinbrechenden Sintflut stehen."

stands aghast at the coming catastrophe which must wipe out the entire German people. "Rottenness of rottenness! and all is rotten!" — this is the burthen of his plaint. The "Landeskirche" is rotten and has been rotten ever since the vagaries of rationalism and pietism swept over the ill-treated Church of Luther. The pastors, bishops, and rulers are rotten to the core. The people are rotten. Their works are rotten and stink to heaven. It is all a "gottsjaemmerlicher Sumpf"! Pastor Brakebusch states the situation very forcibly, just as Luther did in his time. The others mince their terms, qualify their statements, juggle their words, and hope against hope — yet the burden of their blasts is the same, a dreadful delineation of horror, frightfulness, and utter pollution. Kaftan in his *Was nun?* on page 36 draws up this statement: "And what has the Church, the witness of truth, done in this distress and perplexity? The real status of the Church is flashed before our eyes by the affair of Jatho. Jatho denied the Savior, denied God, denied eternity. Others did the same. Yet Jatho demanded for such denial a place in the ministry, and a multitude of pastors and professors supported his claims. In the very fact there became apparent the utter impotency and dissolution of all theology and the whole Church, which can scarcely be surpassed. Yet what could such an impotent Church do? She has become a salt that has lost its savor." [4]

Let us, then, take their statements for granted. Those who have heard the reports which time and again issued forth from earnest, truth-seeking men, know that such a description of the German state-church cannot be far from truth. What interests us more than the awful disease is the cure which these men suggest. Each of the six brochures is written to "slip through a medicine that can cure any case of tuberculosis." Those who have written the pamphlets are, no doubt, true friends of the dying patients lying in the wretched wards of the huge charnel-house of death — the state-church of Germany. Moreover, they are men who ought

4) "Und was hat die Kirche getan in diesen Wirren und Noeten, die Zeugin der Wahrheit? Wie es um die Kirche stand, beleuchtete blitzartig die Jathoaffaere. Jatho leugnete den Heiland, leugnete Gott, leugnete die Ewigkeit. Das taten andere auch. Aber Jatho begehrte fuer dieses sein Leugnen Platz im geistlichen Amte, und ein grosser Haufe von Professoren und Pastoren unterstuetzte seinen Anspruch. Darin offenbarte sich eine Haltlosigkeit, eine Selbstaufloesung von Theologie und Kirche, die schwerlich ueberboten werden kann. Was aber vermag eine so haltlos gewordene Kirche? Sie ist dumm gewordenes Salz."

to know, for they are pastors, professors, teachers, men of experience and learning and also, we may add, of painstaking observation. What, then, is the medicine which they "slip through" to save the dying man? It is very much like the nostrum of the quack friend that brought our dying patient to a more than speedy death. It must be "slipped through," for the Great Physician will not have it. Nor will the nurses and attendants, abiding by the direction of the Great Physician, have it. Nor will the patients who are accustomed to entrust themselves to the real, authorized, divine Physician have it. The writers mean well enough, but they have lost faith in the materia medica of the Great Healer of souls; and so they are loath to follow His directions, preferring and trying out prophylactics, restoratives, panaceas, and embrocations of their own invention. Let us see.

All of the would-be practitioners are glad that the patients are going to be sequestered from the old-time, infected and moribund cesspool of contagion — the German state-church. Expressed in ecclesiastical terms, they rejoice in the fact that the baneful amalgamation of Church and State is to end. Pastor Brakebusch writes exultingly: "I do not claim that the Church of Jesus Christ has suffered shipwreck, or that the Church of Luther has collapsed, but that a meretricious church, a heterodox church is facing dissolution, a fact which must seem only self-evident; yes, a process of decay which we must really welcome, since only in this way both the possibility and the necessity of organizing a new church have been brought nearer to us." [5] The same spirit of rejoicing breathes through the other brochures. Kaftan in *Die staatsfreie Volkskirche* declares: "So state-churchism has outlived itself, and will crumble to pieces." [6] It is true, reports from other reliable sources show that such a separation has not yet been really accomplished. Moved by questions of bread and butter, dignity and security, thousands of pastors are still clinging to the battered hull of the

5) "Ich weise nicht nach, dass die Kirche Jesu Christi Schiffbruch gelitten habe, oder dass die Kirche Luthers zusammengebrochen sei, sondern eine Unkirche, eine Afterkirche, ihrer Aufloesung entgegengeht, ein Umstand, der ... ja als selbstverstaendlich erscheinen muss. Mehr noch: es sollte uns dieser Vorgang der Zersetzung sogar willkommen sein, weil dadurch endlich die Moeglichkeit und die Notwendigkeit, zu einer neuen, wirklichen Kirche zu kommen, uns unweigerlich naehergerueckt ist." (p. 23.)

6) "Also ueberlebt ist das Staatskirchentum, und zusammenbrechen wird es!" (p. 16.)

"Staatskirchentum" drifting hopelessly with the tide of general destruction. Hundreds of weary, fainting hearts are crying all over Germany, "Let us by no means leave the old church; for there we have just what we want." [7] However, the men who have written the pamphlets have gotten over that. They wish to have the incubus removed which for a century has choked the vital breath of life out of the Church, and rendered it a helpless, disgraced utensil in the hands of jurists and politicians.

Nevertheless, while the path which lies open to them seems so very clearly, simply, and well pointed out by Him, to whom the Church owes its foundation and existence, they deliberately shirk this road, which alone would prove their salvation. They seek a way which is fully as perilous as the one that they are about to leave. The "Staatskirchentum" is a thing of the past; but upon its ruins must be built a "Volkskirchentum," and what this "Volkskirchentum" is Kaftan describes in his *Die staatsfreie Volkskirche* thus: "I certainly do not despise the free church. I surely have a high regard for a church like the old-Lutheran church in Prussia, and I rejoice in it. However, what we should try to realize is not a free-church, but an independent folk-church. Lutheranism and folk-churchism are correspondent. We who love our people cannot bear to leave it, so far as the Church is concerned. We Protestants cannot get away from a certain *entente cordiale* over against the State — even the lasting injustice perpetrated against the evangelical Church has not abrogated this — and the State needs the Church! However, not merely the State, but — and this is the more weighty consideration — no less the Church of Jesus Christ. The folk-church will pave for her work ways such as no free church can." [8]

The precise character of this "Volkskirche" is graphically de-

---

7) "Nur nicht fort von dem Alten! Wir haben da ja, was wir wollen!" (Pastor Clausen in *Koestliche Perle*, Dec. 1920.)

8) "Ich verachte gewiss die Freikirche nicht. Ich habe grossen Respekt vor einer Kirche wie der der Altlutherischen in Preussen, und ich freue mich ihrer. Aber was wir erstreben sollen, ist nicht Freikirche, sondern die *staatsfreie Volkskirche*. Luthertum und Volkskirche sind kongenial. Wir, die wir unser Volk lieben, moechten auch kirchlich nicht von ihm lassen. Uns Protestanten steckt die Staatsfreundlichkeit im Blut — selbst das dauernde Unrecht, das der Staat der evangelischen Kirche zufuegt, hat das noch nicht ertoetet —, und der Staat braucht die Volkskirche. Aber nicht der Staat nur, sondern — und das ist uns das Groessere — nicht minder die Kirche Jesu Christi. Die Volkskirche bahnt ihr fuer ihr Wirken Wege, die keine Freikirche ihr bieten kann." (p. 17.)

picted in Kaftan's *Was nun?* where we are told: "Let it therefore be a folk-church, so far as this is possible; and above all, a *church*, a real church, and that means, a congregation in which there is no longer a blending of religion and politics, a congregation in which conservatives, liberals, and Socialists may enjoy perfect citizenship to such an extent that whenever ecclesiastical offices are to be filled, this shall not be decided according to one's political or sociological convictions, but strictly according to one's attitude toward the confession of the Church and according to efficiency." [9] Certainly, as Dr. Kaftan conceives, this "Volkskirche" must be a true Church. "A Church without Word and Sacrament, without the Gospel, without Christ is not a Church." [10] Yet in *Wie verfassen wir die Kirche ihrem Zwecke entsprechend?* he says: A folk-church is tolerant as a matter of course. This toleration shows itself in this, that the Church allows all such to remain in the Church as are willing to accept the services of the Church." [11]

On page 11, Dr. Kaftan states even more, for he says: "However, we are a sober people, who keep their eyes open and see things as they are. Among our church-members there are not a few who are not merely absolutely indifferent, but downright antagonistic to the Church." [12] All these are to be conceded both vote and membership, for: "A folk-church is tolerant as a matter of course." [13]

True, while all members, including women, are to be given suffrage, the real administration of congregational affairs is to rest with the "Kirchenvorstand," consisting of men known for their

9) "Also Volkskirche, soweit diese moeglich ist, und zwar als Kirche, als reine Kirche, und das heisst, als eine Gemeinde, in der es nichts mehr gibt von einer Verquickung von Religion und Politik, eine Gemeinde, *in der Konservative, Liberale und Sozialdemokraten voellig gleiche Heimatrechte haben* bis dahin, dass bei der Besetzung aller geistlichen Aemter nicht nach der staatspolitischen oder sozialpolitischen Ueberzeugung, sondern lediglich nach der Stellung zum Bekenntnis der Kirche und nach der Tuechtigkeit im Beruf gefragt wird." (p. 47.)

10) "Eine Kirche ohne Wort und Sakrament, ohne das Evangelium, ohne Christum ist keine Kirche." (p. 47.)

11) "Eine Volkskirche ist grundsaetzlich *weitherzig*. Diese Weitherzigkeit hat sich darin zu dokumentieren, *dass sie alle in der Kirche bleiben laesst, die sich noch den Dienst der Kirche gefallen lassen.*" (p. 12.)

12) "Aber nuechterne Leute sind wir, die die Augen aufmachen und die Wirklichkeit sehen. Unter unsern Kirchengliedern sind zahlreiche, *die der Kirche in voelliger Gleichgueltigkeit, ja, nicht wenige, die ihr feindlich gegenueberstehen.*"

13) "Eine Volkskirche ist grundsaetzlich weitherzig."

"good repute, approved Christian character, Christian intelligence, and experience." [14])

Also: "The church council performs its work not as representative of the congregation, but as an independent body, for only in this way real and effective work can be assured." [15]) This means that, in the end, all administrative powers are vested in the church council, which, as it consists of Christian men, would naturally uphold the standard of the faithful confession of truth. They would, too, constitute the real church within the greater church of the masses, the "ecclesiola in ecclesia" of which Dr. Hilbert's pamphlet treats, and the "freie Geisteskirche" (the free church of the Spirit) that Pastor Brakebusch advocates in his pamphlet *Die Babylonische Verwirrung*. Very poignantly does Dr. Hilbert express this on page 60 of his *Ecclesiola in Ecclesia:* Not upon the masses, neither upon the perfection of its organization, nor upon its external division into church councils and presbyteries depends, humanly speaking, the future of our folk-church, but upon her inner organization through the gathering of a narrower circle of all such as earnestly desire to be Christians and to confess the Gospel with hand and mouth in every parish." [16]) Again: "Salvation from a 'mob-church' can come only through the *ecclesiola in ecclesia.*" [17])

But enough of this. What these men, earnest though they be, desire to organize, is not a Church, pleasing to God because based upon His directions given in His Word, but a monster begotten of fear, doubt, ignorance, and philosophy. In commending the general principles underlying the "Volkskirche" Dr. Kaftan himself says: "Das sind so *allgemein vernuenftige Grundsaetze,* dass sie sich vor jedem Forum vertreten lassen." Not Scripture, but human reason, has lent the *materiale* out of which the prodigy of a "Volkskirche"

---

14) "guten Ruf, bewaehrte christliche Gesinnung, kirchliche Einsicht und Erfahrung." (p. 12.)

15) "Der Kirchenvorstand treibt sein Werk nicht als ein Ausschuss der Gemeindevertretung, sondern als ein *selbstaendiger Faktor:* denn nur so wird eine rechte und tatkraeftige Taetigkeit desselben erzielt." (p. 13.)

16) "*Nicht auf den Massen der Volkskirche,* auch nicht auf ihrer *Durchorganisierung,* nicht auf einer *aeusseren Organisation* in Kirchenvorstaenden und Presbyterien ruht, menschlich geredet, die Zukunft unserer Volkskirche, sondern auf ihrer inneren Organisation durch *Sammlung eines engeren Kreises solcher,* die mit Ernst Christen wollen sein und das Evangelium mit Hand und Mund bekennen in jeder Parochie." (p. 60.)

17) "Die Rettung vor der 'Poebelkirche' ist die *ecclesiola in ecclesia.*" (p. 61.)

has been brought forth. Yet, hardly of reason either. For the whole conception of a "Volkskirche" as an organization of all such as are willing to accept the services of the Church (*Wie verfassen wir die Kirche,* etc., p. 12) irrespective of their personal attitude towards the confessions avowed by such Church, is *unreasonable.* It is a house divided against itself, for there are really two organizations, forcéd together into one heterogeneous compound, the *massa perdita,* whose business it is mainly to uphold the external dignity of the Church and to feed the treasuries of the congregations, and the *ecclesiola in ecclesia,* consisting of true believers, who constitute the core of the Church. With this in view the whole inanity of the thing becomes apparent at once. The men who advocate this monster are worse quacks than were the friends who slipped through the medicine that finished our patient in the sanatorium. Those friends at least realized that the sufferers from consumption must be isolated. Here our theological quacks essay to promote the well-being of perfectly healthy people by putting them into a ward crowded with victims of TB. Nor is the method scientific, for it attempts to produce one new, good product out of two antipodian and antithetical elements, just as if mother would try to bake a delicious apple-pie by mixing a slice of apple with a bunch of onions. And lastly, the whole scheme is at variance with Scripture. Is it possible that these men have never studied the Scripture-passages dealing with the doctrine concerning the Church? Do they not know who constitute the Church — the real, true, invisible Church of saints? Are they ignorant of that simple dogmatic formula which in a nutshell expresses the entire doctrine of Scripture as regards the Church: *Sola fides in Christum membra ecclesiae constituit?* Have they never read Acts 5, 14; 1 Pet. 2, 9; John 11, 52; Eph. 1, 23, and other clear passages that show what Christ primarily means by "Church"? With regard to local churches, that is, the gathering of believers into outward visible congregations for the purpose of preaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments, have they never heard how this organization should be effected? Will they not adjust their organization according to 1 Pet. 4, 11; Rom. 16, 14, etc.? Have they never considered 2 Cor. 6, 14? Are they not aware that it is not our primary purpose to establish a huge organization called "Christian Church," but rather to testify of Christ through the preaching of the pure and unadulterated Gospel? Have they never read the history of the American Lutheran Church, which proves that wherever the

Gospel is preached and the Sacraments are administered according to Christ's institution, the saints of God gather around the Gospel-banner with joy and ready willingness, organized into a mighty fellowship by their common confession, and cheerfully bearing every burden and making every sacrifice which Christ's cause demands? Surely they have read all this, for their books bear witness of such knowledge. In his booklet *Wie verfassen wir die Kirche,* etc.? Dr. Kaftan says: "Other countries have paved the way for us so far as the separation of Church and State is concerned. True! But was the problem really solved? So far as I see, just as imperfectly as where Lutheranism, from its very beginning, was in a position to develop itself independently of the state, as in North America. In America they have not gotten beyond a division into independent sects, emended in the course of time according to congregational principles." [18] Again: "But apart from the fact that this view (that internal affairs should be left to individual congregations) is based upon the false supposition that each evangelical congregation is a unit, so far as the question of self-direction is concerned, this would mean to divide the Church into independent sects." [19] Again: "Hofmann has said: 'We all have the same faith, if, indeed, we have the Christian faith, and each one has his own theology, if, indeed, he has any! All those who cannot get used to this must join the "Missourians," who represent a papistic Lutheranism.'" [20]

Expressions such as these make us gasp for words with which to characterize such utter obtuseness. Of late many of the foremost

---

18) "Andere Laender sind Deutschland in der Trennung von Kirche und Staat vorangegangen. Gewiss! Aber wurde in diesen jene Aufgabe geloest? Soweit ich sehe, ebensowenig wie da, wo das Luthertum von Anfang an sich selbstaendig und staatsfrei zu entwickeln in der Lage gewesen ist, wie das vor allem in Nordamerika der Fall ist. Man hat es in Amerika nicht ueber ein independentistisches, im Laufe der Zeit mehr und mehr kongregationalistisch verbessertes Kirchenwesen hinausgebracht." (p. 6.)

19) "Aber abgesehen davon, dass diese Auffassung (die internen Angelegenheiten seien ganz der Einzelgemeinde zu ueberlassen) auf einer irrtuemlichen Voraussetzung beruht, naemlich der, dass jede evangelische Gemeinde in der sogenannten Richtungsfrage eine in sich geschlossene sei, heisst das die Kirche independentistisch aufloesen." (p. 16.)

20) "Hofmann hat gesagt: Wir haben alle denselben Glauben, wenn anders wir einen christlichen haben, und jeder hat seine eigene Theologie, wenn anders er eine hat. *Wer sich darein nicht schicken kann, muss sich den Missouriern anschliessen, die ein roemisches Luthertum repraesentieren.*" (p. 35. Minoritaetenschutz.)

scholars of the world have stated again and again that it is utterly impossible for them to comprehend the psychology of the German mind. We are nonplused at least at the psychology of the German theologian. There is but one explanation for the mystery. In spite of the vast amount of pious verbiage contained in the brochures, the writers plainly reveal themselves as such as have not the least inkling of the Scriptural doctrine concerning the Church. And what is worse: even though they had all knowledge, we are convinced that they would nevertheless not follow the plain dictates of God's Word. After all, these men are not seeking to establish a new Church after the heart of Christ, but to reestablish the old state-church, under a different form and name, with the same disregard for Christ's Word of truth that characterized the godless "Staatskirche," and with the reestablishment of the "Volkskirche," conceived and executed according to their misguided notions, they are creating the very thing of which they have falsely accused the "Missourians," and what the author calls "papistisches Luthertum." Their "Volkskirche" is in fact the exact counterpart of the Church of Rome — a hierarchy of dead forms, dead institutions, dead members, and dead theology, — a veritable *bête noir* with all the detestable characteristics of the Roman Church, only less adhesive, virile, impressive, since Rome perfectly knows what she wants, while these men neither know what they want, nor want what they really know in their hearts to be their sacred duty. Inured to a dead formalism, deep in the rut of ossified thought, intensely narrow in understanding, hopelessly opinionated so far as their own glory is concerned, despising the Word of God and the men who would preach it to them, distrustful of the people to whom they would speak the message of life, despairing of the efficacy of the living testimony of the Gospel, these men present to us a most pitiful picture of what it means to be lukewarm, — neither hot nor cold, neither strong nor weak, neither orthodox nor liberal, neither confessing the truth as fearless children of God, nor quite willing to turn to the other extreme, from which they shrink with horror.

Not in this way can the Evangelical Lutheran Church be reestablished in Germany! Let the men who love Christ and the Gospel at once free themselves from all the dead forms and ideals among which they have been reared. Let them take up their old Bibles and read them with childlike faith and the heartfelt prayer that the Holy Ghost would grant them wisdom and knowledge. Let them go back to Luther's Catechism, to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, to the Lutheran fathers of the sixteenth century,

and to the clear, simple, and forceful testimony of our American Lutheran Church, especially that of Dr. Walther. Let them study what these men have written on the Church and the ministry. Then let them tear themselves away from the fetters which still chain them to the state-church and its theology, and go forth among the people simply as preachers of the Gospel-truth, without any thought of establishing a huge "Volkskirche," but with the one purpose clearly set in their minds to preach Christ and Him crucified. That is all they have to do. The rest God Himself has promised to take care of, and so they will find that after all the Gospel is still a power of God unto salvation, also among the poor German people that have been fed by unmoral preachers on an unmoral theology for decades and centuries. Then also that great bugbear of fear — the bread-and-butter question — will solve itself, of which many of the advocates of the "Volkskirche" seem to be so very much afraid. And then, finally, will Luther's ideal be realized — the pure, unadulterated Gospel of Christ will be preached to a people, strong in faith and faithful in confession of Him, "who has called them out of darkness into His marvelous light." 1 Pet. 2, 9. As Luther's whole work of Reformation was based upon one outstanding basic act, and as from this one basic act the entire regeneration of the Church came, so it is now, — under circumstances and conditions very similar to those at the time when Luther began his work, — for those who would follow in Luther's steps to let every other consideration be one of secondary importance, and with might and main to attend to the King's chief business, expressed in the command: "Preach the Gospel." With that spirit may the Lord bless all those who would again build the walls of Zion in Germany!

We dare not conclude this article without calling the reader's attention to what we must regard as a most vicious and insidious misrepresentation of Luther's views on the Church. That the writers of the brochures should, in support of their theories, fall back upon the great Reformer is but natural; and that, in the extensive survey of his wide literature, there should be passages which seemingly read in their favor does not seem strange to any one who is aware of the conditions under which Luther was obliged to compose his works. However, neither the advocates of the state-church nor those of the folk-church may justly cite the great protagonist of truth in defense of their notions. Luther's ideal of the local, visible Church on earth was neither that of a Church blended with the State into one powerful unit for righteousness,

nor that of a Church of the masses, gathered around a nucleus of Christians confessing the truth. Very strikingly does Dr. Hilbert point out in his *Ecclesiola in Ecclesia* that because of his very fixed conceptions on State and Church Luther was of necessity antagonistic to any and every attempt to fuse the domain of Caesar with that of Christ.[21] No one who has read Luther will refuse to grant Dr. Hilbert this point in the argument. It is only a pity that Dr. Hilbert does not observe that the very dart which he hurls against his opponents is a boomerang which strikes back at his own position. For the very arguments which Luther maintains against the state-church are directed also against the folk-church which men like Dr. Hilbert would now establish in Germany. Just because Luther could conceive of a Christian state, for the very same reason he could not conceive of an entire nation, or a part of a nation as such, constituting the Christian Church. In other words, Luther wanted no Church of the unbelieving masses, but a Church made up of true, confessing Christians, ruled by the Spirit and the Word. A few quotations will bear us out on this.

With regard to the true character of the Church Luther writes in his interpretation of Ps. 16: "And since now that time is here of which Jesus has prophesied, and the fury of the Romanistic perdition is plainly opposing the Gospel, neither knowing it or permitting others to know it, it behooves us to steel our minds with the Word of God, and to believe most firmly and know most surely that the Church of Christ is nothing *but a spiritual communion of believers,* wherever these may be in the world." St. Louis Ed. IV, 768. Here Luther emphasizes the spirituality of the Church; for in his opinion the Church is nothing else than the communion of believers. This strikes us the more forcibly when we consider that this statement is but the corroboration of an asseveration immediately preceding the one cited. There he says: "For we believe that the holy universal (*catholica*) Church is the communion (*communio*) of saints." IV, 967. And since Luther regards the Church as the communion of true, believing saints, he claims for it the quality of invisibility. With regard to this Luther writes: "Therefore we rightly confess in our holy Christian faith that we believe a holy Church. For it is invisible, dwells at a place in the spirit, to which no one can approach; for which reason her holiness cannot be seen." *Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians,* IX,

21) "Einen christlichen Staat kennt Luther ebensowenig wie ein christliches Schusterhandwerk." (*Ecclesiola in Ecclesia,* p. 23.)

702. These true saints and believers are found everywhere where the Gospel is preached and the Sacraments are administered according to Christ's institution. "The Christian Church is there where Christ is the Head, and where His Word is found, where He also calls children to Himself. And those so called become His brethren, His sisters and coheirs. Therefore in every parish where children are baptized, and the Gospel is preached, and Christ is depicted to the people so that they receive Him, there is the Church. Hence also our Church here at Wittenberg is the true, real, Christian Church." Sermon on Matt. 18, 2—5, VII, 873. True, wherever the Gospel is preached, and through it true saints are gathered around the standard of Christ, there will be found, besides true believers, hypocrites and false Christians. "In this text (Matt. 22, 1—14) we are taught first that there are always wicked people in the Church, that is, hypocrites, both in the ministry as also in general; and that they cannot all be recognized and separated, which only Christ can do on Judgment Day; and that accordingly the Church is not to be judged according to its outward appearance, because there will be found in it even the most hidden hypocrites. And we must know this fact in order that the Church should not be condemned on account of the wicked, or the demand be made that no wicked man or sinner should be in it. This error has been the fountain and cause of much distress, and has thoroughly shaken the Church. For, although the manifestly wicked and abominable should not be tolerated, who can judge those who are secretly evil? But to obscure and confound this difference between the manifest and the secret wicked means to pervert the Church and the marriage of the Son." Sermon on the 20th Sunday after Trinity, XII, 1923. 1924. Here Luther states a truth which those who establish a folk-church with the evident purpose of tolerating indifferent and hostile elements, in other words, clear and manifest sinners, should indelibly inscribe upon their hearts, both as a lesson and a warning. "The manifestly wicked and abominable should not be tolerated!" This truth Luther emphasizes again and again, with words that cannot admit of any doubt. Thus in his sermon on the Fifth Sunday after Epiphany he writes: "This should not mean that the Church should destroy the wicked. But she should excommunicate and ban them as heathen, so that they might come to the knowledge of their sins and make amends, and others fear their example and beware of sins." Sermon on Matt. 13, 24—30, XIIIa, 190. Again: "If he [the wicked] would not hear even then [when admonished by the

whole Church], then they should declare him excommunicated, and let him go, and regard him as a heathen and a publican, and as one who is no sheep, nor as one who would be sought, but one who is bound to be lost." Sermon on Matt. 18, 15—18, XII, 920.

These quotations, to which multitudes of others, held in a similar strain, might be added, sufficiently and clearly portray Luther's fundamental view of the Church. What Luther desired above all was the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments according to Christ's command. Such preaching would not be in vain, for by it the Holy Ghost would call, invite, and convert sinners and gather them into Christian congregations. Certainly there would be hypocrites — subtle, insidious hypocrites, who would hide their malice under the cloak of piety. However, as soon as they or others would manifest themselves as incorrigible sinners, they should be excommunicated, that is, declared as heathen and publicans. A mere application of these principles leaves no room for a folk-church where believers and manifest unbelievers worship side by side. According to Luther, Christ's Church on earth can never be a great, outwardly mighty organization of huge masses, but: "Even so it is to-day: the true Church is a poor, small, miserable, despised little flock, which finds comfort and delights in God and His Word, troubling itself about nothing else. On the other hand, the Pope and his crowd, who have the name that they are the Church, know nothing of God or of His Word, and they should know nothing about it, inasmuch as they concern themselves only with earthly things, and therefore would be honored as Christians only for this reason, that they have greater power, might, money, and goods than other common Christians." Sermon on Luke 2, 22—32, XIIIa, 223. How very fittingly may the last words be applied to the folk-church which the writers of the brochures have in view!

Just one more word in conclusion. Throughout the pamphlets we find expressions of scorn for the free church, that is, for that church organized on the new principles set forth in the quotations of Luther, to which Kaftan applies the name "Missourians." Who are the Missourians both in America and in Germany whom these men so thoroughly contemn? We trust that Kaftan and his fellow-aspirers for a folk-church will seriously peruse their literature, compare their principles with the Word of God, and make them their guide and basis in the attempt to reestablish the Christian Church in Germany. For the Missourians are nothing else than true, earnest Christians, who simply and solely and wholly stand

upon the foundation of the Word of God, preach the Gospel in all its truth and purity, and gather around the preaching of this Gospel all those who would hear, believe, and live as it becomes Christians and children of God. Their slogan is: *Sola Scriptura, sola gratia, solo Christo,* just as it was Christ's and the apostles', and Luther's, and that of all true Christians. They are a little flock, it is true, for the number of the true disciples of Christ is — a little flock. Before the eye of the casual observer they appear very badly united, — very little of a mighty organization such as the folk-church should be! In reality, however, they are knitted together by the common confession, the common faith, the common hope, the common obedience to the Bible. Small though they be, their testimony is tremendous, because it is the pure testimony of Christ. Christ working with them, they are therefore among themselves that testimony which decides every issue of conscience and faith. In all other matters Christian charity prevails. They do not look for support to any state, king, or masses of power. In fact, they will not have any gift unless it be hallowed by the giver's faith and prayer and gratitude to God. So in the end there are very few that turn their riches into the coffers of their churches. Yet their churches are not poor. Willing love, flowing from hearts filled with faith, readily offers upon the Lord's altars those things which are needed for the preaching of the Gospel at home and abroad. And thus, their hearts turned to God, sanctified by faith, their hopes fixed in the Word of salvation, receiving and accepting the precepts of their divine King, they live in this world, not recognized by the world, because they are not of this world, a light that shines in darkness, a salt that keeps the world from putrefaction, — humble, faithful servants of Christ, full of love for Him and His Word, doing in all things His will unto His glory. Such are the Missourians, of whom the writers would have the Christians beware as advocates of a hierarchical Lutheranism. Why should this be? Why should they who would build Christ's Church antagonize those who, as true Christians, are building it according to Christ's will? There is but one answer. Even they who would thus build the Church, will not so build it as Christ has commanded, will not plant the structure upon that sure foundation upon which it alone rests safe — the foundation of *sola Scriptura.* The words of Mary: "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it!" (John 2, 5) have not entered into the hearts of the men who wrote these books. And that is the pity of it.

Why the Name Lutheran.

II. What Do We Understand by the Term "Lutheran"?

We have declared that we did not give ourselves the name "Lutheran." Much less, therefore, do we associate with the term a meaning that makes the bearing of such a name sinful. True it is, we have not refused to allow ourselves to be called Lutherans. But we do not bear this name because we desire to separate ourselves from other orthodox Christians. We remember that the Corinthians, with their party names, were guilty of this sin. Neither have we permitted this name to be applied to us because we found our teachings upon Luther. And, finally, we confess no new religion under this name. Our Church is no new church and consequently no new sect. The question then is: In what sense do we properly call ourselves Lutherans? We answer briefly: By the term Lutheran nothing else must be understood than that we are Christians who accept as correct those teachings brought back to light through the work of Luther. All who profess these teachings we call Lutherans. We consider him a true Lutheran who believes this doctrine in his heart, through the working of the Holy Ghost, and holds it with a pure conscience. A true Lutheran and a true Christian, a Lutheran Church and a Christian Church, God's Word and Luther's doctrine — these all are one and the same thing. With joy and confidence, therefore, we sing: —

> God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure
> Shall to eternity endure.

And we speak thus not as though Luther wrote as an apostle by divine inspiration of the Holy Ghost. We declare, rather, that Luther's doctrine as we know it is drawn from God's Word, and that through him the Reformation, acknowledged by all as necessary, was effected. In this sense Luther once advised the Lutherans who were called upon by Duke George for vindication of their faith to reply: "We will abide by the holy Gospel. Luther himself desires not to be a Lutheran, except in so far as he teaches Holy Scriptures purely." We fully know what will be said when we declare it to be our belief that the Lutheran Church is the true Church of Jesus Christ upon earth. Our most lenient opponent will say: Indeed, we consider the Lutheran Church *a* church, but not *the* Church of Jesus Christ. The belief that there are several true churches must necessarily be held by those who can never be certain of their doctrine, since they are in their conscience convicted of false doctrine. They must, with that sweet dream of

many true churches, comfort themselves secretly and strive to soothe their crying consciences. Such a belief in several or many true churches makes it impossible for them positively to consider themselves the Church of Jesus Christ. They necessarily acknowledge themselves to be a sect. We, as Lutherans, thank God that He has brought us into the communion of His true Church. We are confident of this, and joyfully confess before the world that we belong to her and not to a sect.

Others will perhaps say: There we hear it again. We know this speech. All sectarians speak in that way. In fact, it is characteristic of every sect to declare it is the only true saving Church, and all others false. It is clearly evident that you Lutherans are arch-papists; for is not the assumption that you are the only saving Church essentially popish? You have thus betrayed yourselves. — We will consider these charges. Therefore suspend your judgment until we have spoken and you have thoroughly weighed our defense.

We are in no sense of the word fanatics. We know that the invisible Kingdom of Christ does not consist solely of those who call themselves Lutherans. This is one of the very reasons why the name of our Church is so glorious. This is one reason why we cling to her with whole-hearted accord, and will, in our simple way, publicly bear witness, pray, fight for her, and endeavor to remove all disgrace that may come upon her. We must remain loyal to her until death, because we know she is not comprised within a human name, country, or time, but is found wherever there are followers of Jesus Christ. The Lutheran Church, in the first place, is not limited either to those who have borne this name from youth, or assumed it later. We extend our hand to any person who submits, without guile, to the entire written Word of God, cherishes it in his heart, and professes before men the true faith in our dear Lord Jesus Christ. We regard such a person as our fellow-believer in Christ, a member of our Church and a Lutheran, regardless of what sect he may be concealed in or kept a prisoner. We believe that God can preserve thousands of His children even where everything appears to be swallowed up in Baal-service. 1 Kings 19, 7—18. The Word of God is sufficiently powerful to convert men to God even where it is mixed with much human teaching; for Christ rules even in the midst of His enemies. Ps. 110, 2. We condemn no man (let him call himself what he will), but repeat the declaration of God: "He that believeth and is baptized shall

be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." An entirely different question it is when we are asked, How is the true Church recognized, and when *is* it visible? It is also a different question when you hear, What is the Church? To the first question we answer: The Church is recognized by the pure preaching of the Word and the right use of the holy Sacraments. To the second question we reply: The Church is the congregation of all believers. (*Augsburg Confession,* Art. VII, 7. 8.) Therefore our fathers wrote in the introduction to the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church: "As to the condemnation, censures, and objections of godless doctrines, and especially of that which has arisen concerning the Lord's Supper, it is in no way our design and purpose to condemn those men who err from a certain simplicity of mind, and nevertheless are not blasphemers against the truth of the heavenly doctrine, much less, indeed, entire churches; rather has it been our intention and disposition in this manner openly to censure and condemn only the fanatical opinions and their obstinate and blasphemous teachers (which, we judge, should in no way be tolerated). For we have no doubt whatever that, even in those churches which have hitherto not agreed with us in all things many godly and by no means wicked men are found, who follow their own simplicity, and do not understand aright the matter itself, but in no way approve the blasphemies which are cast forth against the Holy Supper. We are also in great hope that, if they would be taught aright concerning all these things, the Spirit of the Lord aiding them, they would agree with us, and with our churches and schools, to the infallible truth of God's Word."

We also read in the *Apology of the Augsburg Confession,* in Article XIII ("Of Monastic Vows"): "We do not speak of all; it is possible that there are some in the cloisters who know the Gospel of Christ, and do not trust in their good works." Luther in his writings agrees fully with these words. He not only reminds us that God, in the darkest days of papacy, preserved a whole congregation of His children, a whole Church, but that even after the Evangelical light of the Reformation, righteous souls are held in the bondage of popery who are actually members of the true Church. We read in his *Commentary on Genesis,* chap. 28, 17: "The Pope and his followers are not the Church. Should any one raise an objection to this, saying that they have Baptism and the Lord's Supper and such, we would answer: Those who have the pure Word and Baptism belong to us and to the true Church.

Those, however, who at the same time have the churchly pomp of man-made dogmas are not the Church. Although they have Baptism and the Gospel, they nevertheless have them to no purpose." Luther passes the same judgment upon sincere people who are in outward communion with the sects. He writes in his letter "Concerning Anabaptism": "We must confess that the enthusiasts (*Schwaermer*) have the Scriptures and God's Word in other articles, and whoever hears it and believes will be saved, even though the teachers are unholy, heretical blasphemers of Christ."

The old Lutheran theologians never considered those the only Lutherans who called themselves Lutheran. They always spoke of those who bear the name Lutheran, but only dishonor it and by their carnal conduct prove themselves no members of the true Church, no members of the spiritual body of Christ, no true Christians. They hold, on the other hand, that there were those who, indeed, do not call themselves Lutherans and yet are true Christians and therefore Lutherans in reality. Of many proofs in support of this, we choose only one. In 1573 the Reformed Christians of France (commonly designated as Huguenots) suffered the most horrible persecution at the hands of the papists. In view of the fact that nearly seventy thousand of these people were killed with unheard-of devilish cruelty at the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve and during the following two months, a Lutheran theologian, who was joint-author of the Formula of Concord, and who through the trickery of the Reformed had been expelled from Leipzig, published the following:[1] "There were many innocent people mercilessly slaughtered in the persecution in France and the Low Countries. There were many martyrs among the Sacramentarians,[2] for whom even a heart of stone must justly sympathize. But, dear Lord, all such were killed as Lutherans, not, indeed, because of their doctrine of the Holy Sacrament, but because they would not support the popish abominations. Therefore God stood by them in their dire need and called them away with gladness and comfort in their hearts, forgiving and patiently bearing their weakness and the delusion concerning the Holy Sacrament, even as He always ordains the weaknesses and mistakes of His believers for the best, as long as they are not malicious or knowingly and obstinately held." Thus we hear a man speak who most emphatically rejected

1) N. Selneccer, author of "All Glory Be to God on High."

2) Those who denied the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament.

the Reformed doctrine. And yet he was not of a false condemning and sectarian spirit, but one moved by his love for the truth. It is true that Lutherans, because of their earnest rejection of all false teachings, are often charged with being intolerant, uncharitable, and factious. None deserve this less, however, as long as we bear our name rightly, by refusing to limit the true Church with this name.

Just as little do we believe our Church is confined to any land or time. With the name we profess to belong to the true, catholic (universal, Apostolic) Church, whose doctrine Luther preached. We speak very clearly in our Confessions concerning the first point: "We have the comforting article in our Creed, 'I believe in the catholic (universal) Christian Church,' in order to avoid the probability that any one think (as popery teaches) that the Church is confined to this or that land, dominion, or condition, like the civil government. It remains a fact that the true Church is the sum total of all men everywhere in the world, from the rising to the setting of the sun, who truly believe in Christ and are ruled by one Gospel, one Christ, one Baptism, and Sacrament through the Holy Spirit, even though they have dissimilar ceremonies." (*Apology of Augsburg Confession,* Art. VII.) Luther says the same in these words: "Christendom is not only in the Romish Church, but throughout the world. For the prophets have told that the Gospel of Christ should be proclaimed throughout all the earth. Ps. 2, 8. Christendom is scattered throughout the Pope's realm, among the Turks, the Persians, the Tartars, and wherever men are found. These are united spiritually in one Gospel and faith, and are under the one head, Christ." (Cf. Supplement to the "Major Confession concerning the Lord's Supper," 1528. We cannot refrain from quoting Luther once more in order to acquit him of any sectarian conception of the Church. He writes on Gal. 1, 2: "Therefore the Church is holy in all places, even among the enthusiasts (*Schwaermer*) and factious spirits, in as far as they do not deny and reject the Scriptures and Sacraments. For those who entirely reject these do not belong to the Church. But where the Word and Sacraments remain, there is the holy Church, and it matters not whether the Antichrist himself reign in its midst; for even he sits not in the devil's house, in a pigsty, nor among the unbelieving people, but in the holiest place, yea, in the temple of God." 2 Thess. 2, 4. It is clear that God's temple exists even among spiritual tyrants, who rule and rage

within it. True believers are found under all tyrants. Speaking truthfully we must confess that the Church exists everywhere in the earth where the Word and Sacraments are found. But Jews, Turks, enthusiasts, and factious spirits, or heretics, are not the Church; for these deny and destroy the Word and Sacraments.

Neither is the Church limited to any age or time. As long as there has been an orthodox Church on earth, so long has there been a Lutheran Church. It sounds strange, but it is true that the Lutheran Church is as old as the world; for she has no other doctrine than that which the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles received from God and proclaimed. The name Lutheran, indeed, did not arise until three hundred years ago, but not the doctrine which that name signifies. Accordingly the question: "Where was the Lutheran Church before Luther?" is easily answered thus: "The Lutheran Church was wherever there still were Christians who with all their hearts believed in Jesus Christ and His holy Word and would not surrender this faith, which alone can save, for human ordinances, but who made this faith their final refuge in the hour of death." The Romish Church has had to acknowledge that our doctrine is not new, but was generally known before Luther. It has incessantly charged that the Lutheran teachings are only the renewed heresies of the Waldensians, Albigensians, and Hussites. We hear from a certain Romish writer, Reinerius, how general the doctrines of these Christians were and wherein the alleged heresies consisted. This papist pretended for a time to be a Waldensian, but later he entered the Dominican order, and finally became general inquisitor against the heretics. He reports: "Of all sects that have ever existed none is more destructive [to the Romish Church] than that of the poor of Lyons [thus the Waldensians were called]. This is true for three reasons. In the first place, none is older. Some say this sect existed since the time of Sylvester; others, since the time of the apostles. In the second place, none is more general. There is hardly a country in which they have not settled. Finally, all the others, with their public mischief, incite men to abhor God, while these Waldensians and Lyonese have a great show of piety. For they live righteously before men and believe everything concerning God, accepting all the articles contained in the symbols (confessions). They only despise and hate the Romish Church, declaring her to be the church of the godless whore who, according to the Book of Revelation, sits upon the beast. She is, they assert, a church that fell away from the faith under Sylvester, when the

spirit of temporal and earthly things crept into her. It is their conviction that the Pope is the source of all errors, and is ruled by thirst for honor and gold." When Rome grants that such witnesses for apostolic doctrine and against unapostolic popery always existed, and that Luther only championed such doctrines of the truth, she clearly declares that the Lutheran Church existed before Luther and even had its members in the midst of the papacy. This is additional proof that our Church is not concerned with the name, but with the doctrine.

The Freer Manuscripts and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

Dr. Paul E. Kretzmann, St. Louis, Mo.

In the history of the New Testament manuscripts a few facts and dates stand out with peculiar sharpness. Among these we may mention the stupendous undertaking of editing the Complutensian Polyglot, 1514—1517, the first edition of the Greek New Testament by Erasmus, at Basel, in 1516, the *Editio regia* of the printer Stephanus in 1550, the edition by Beza of Geneva in 1565, and that of the brothers Elzevir in Leyden since 1624, whose second printing in 1633 contained the proud advertisement: Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum, whence the expression *Textus receptus*. Of still greater interest for the purpose of textual study and criticism are the dates of the discovery or of the publication of manuscripts within the last four hundred years. Thus the year 1582 is memorable because Beza in that year brought out his Greek New Testament, the text having been revised very carefully on the basis of the *Codex Cantabrigiensis* (D ^{1}), from the monastery of St. Irenaeus at Lyons, and of the *Codex Claromontanus* (D ^{2}), from the monastery of Clermont. In 1628 Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, presented the *Codex Alexandrinus* (A) to Charles I of England. In 1844 and 1859 Tischendorf found the *Codex Sinaiticus* (ℵ) in the Convent of St. Catherine at the foot of Mount Sinai. In 1889 a photographic facsimile reproduction of the *Codex Vaticanus* (B) was published by the Vatican itself, after a number of scholars had, for more than two hundred years, attempted to collate the manuscripts with varying success. In 1843, the New Testament section of the *Codex Ephraemi* (C) was issued by Tischendorf, the manuscript being reproduced line for line, in facsimile.

We are now, and have been for the past fourteen years, in a position to add to these great uncials another very valuable manuscript, or rather two, the "Freer Manuscripts," of which that containing the gospels is known as the Washington Manuscript and has been named W in Gregory's list, while that containing the Pauline Epistles has been designated by the same critic as I. Both manuscripts are uncials, and though the second is rather fragmentary, they are both valuable for the further fixation of the New Testament text.

Both manuscripts were bought by Mr. Charles L. Freer, of Detroit, of an Arab dealer named Ali, in Gizeh, near Cairo, December 19, 1906. They were both written on parchment, and the text of the gospels was everywhere in a fairly legible state, which permitted a careful study as made principally by Professor H. A. Sanders, of the University of Michigan. The fragment of the Pauline Epistles was in an almost hopelessly decayed condition as it came into the hands of Mr. Freer, being practically nothing but a blackened lump of parchment as hard and brittle on the outside as glue. Whereas the leaves of the gospel manuscript were in such a good state of preservation that the skins may be distinguished without difficulty, those of the Pauline Epistles were so brittle that it was necessary to separate them and lift them off very carefully by means of a thin-bladed knife. The gospel manuscript contains the four gospels in the order Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark. In the epistle manuscript there are evidences that the original number of leaves was between 208 and 212. "The legible fragments begin at 1 Cor. 10, 29, and portions of all the remaining Pauline Epistles are found. The Epistle to the Hebrews follows 2 Thessalonians. There have been lost at the beginning of the manuscript fifteen quires and two leaves. On the basis of the amount of text per page in the preserved portion we may reckon Acts at about sixty leaves, or eight quires, of which the last was probably a four-leaf quire; the Catholic Epistles would fill 24 leaves, or three quires, and the Epistle to the Romans with the missing part of 1 Corinthians would require some 34 leaves, *i. e.*, just over four quires. This was, then, the content of the original manuscript." (Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection,* 252.)

A careful investigation seems to have shown that the manuscripts belonged to the Church of Timothy in the Monastery of the Vinedresser, which was located near the third pyramid, and that the first two owners of the gospel manuscript, at any rate,

belonged to the fifth century, and the third to the sixth (*l. c.,* 2. 3). The date of manuscript W is placed by Sanders as the fourth century, "though the beginning of the fifth must still be admitted as a possibility" (*l. c.,* 139). The parent of the manuscript he dates soon after the persecution of Diocletian, in 303.

So far as the *materiale* of the text is concerned, the following conclusion is offered: "It was made up out of six separate parts: Matthew, John 5, 12 to end, Luke 1—8, 12, Luke 8, 13 to end, Mark 1—5, 30, Mark 5, 31 to end" (p. 133). Both manuscripts belong to the Alexandrine group, to which also the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus pertain. The beginning of Mark shows North African influence, Matthew and the last part of Luke are of the Antioch recension. While the text of the gospels from W is not yet edited in its entirety, it seems safe to say, from the evidence offered, that we may hardly expect a new Resultant Text, all indications rather pointing to a further corroboration of the readings accepted by the best conservative scholars and critics.

The number of papyri manuscripts of Bible texts that have been discovered in the last three decades have given a new impetus to Biblical philology, not only on account of their own intrinsic value, but because they corroborate the text in such a remarkable manner. The number of such manuscripts is much larger than is commonly known. In 1910 A. Deissmann, in an article written for the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,* enumerated forty-four Biblical and Christian fragments from these sources. After further critical work by Gregory, Milligan, and others, Cobern (*The New Archeological Discoveries,* 1917) was able to print an annotated list of almost fifty fragments of the New Testament alone (pp. 143—160).

Of special interest to the Bible student are the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, as they have been edited for the past two decades by the Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt. These men, in 1897, for the Egyptian Exploration Fund, excavated the now famous site of Behnesa, the ancient Oxyrhynchus, situated in the Fayum district of the Nile Valley, about 120 miles south of Cairo. Due to the fact that this district had been isolated since about the third or fourth century, the amount of material discovered was so great that the papyri were shipped to England by the ton. The work of editing the masses of manuscripts has been going on steadily since that time, fourteen volumes of Oxyrhynchus papyri having appeared till now.

Naturally, the Bible texts discovered have claimed a great deal

of attention, and it is gratifying to know that they have "proved the integrity of the ancient texts in a manner entirely satisfactory to believers," as Cobern puts it. The following sections from the New Testament are included in these papyri: A fragment of Matt. 1, third century; Mark 10, 50. 51 and 11, 11. 12, fifth or sixth century; John 1 and 20, third century; Rom. 1, fourth century, an uncial with two cursive lines; Matt. 1 and 2, fifth or sixth century, uncial; 1 John 4, late fourth or fifth century, semi-uncial; a fragment of a lost gospel, similar to those of the synoptists, third century; parts of Hebrews, early fourth century; fragment of an uncanonical gospel containing scraps of a conversation between Jesus and a chief priest, fourth or fifth century; John 2, 11—22, fourth century; Rev. 16, 17—20, fifth century; 1 Cor. 7 and 8, fourth century; Phil. 3 and 4, fourth century; Heb. 9, 12—19, fourth century; Rev. 1, 4—7, late third or fourth century; Rev. 3, 19—4, 2, fourth century; Matt. 6, 8—17, fifth or sixth century; Matt. 10, 32—11, 5, fifth century; Jas. 2, 19—3, 9, late third century; Matt. 12, 24—33, fifth century; John 15 and 16, late third century; Jas. 1, 10—18, fourth century; Rev. 5 and 6, early fourth century; 1 Pet. 5, fourth century; Rom. 1, 1—16, sixth or seventh century; Rom. 8, 12—9, 9, third century. As stated above, all of these texts corroborated the ancient texts, and not only the Eastern manuscripts, but also the Codex Bezae, the importance of the latter being emphasized in certain quarters at the present time with much plausibility, especially by Harris and Hoskier.

There are other fragments contained in the Oxyrhynchus papyri which have elicited much comment by scholars, especially the *Logia Jesou,* or "Sayings of Christ," of which several parts have been found, dating back to the third century. It seems that both real and apocryphal sayings of Christ were transmitted by word of mouth, until they were finally collected and given an authority almost equal to that of the gospels. There is a prayer from the late third or the fourth century which makes a strong appeal to the Christians of to-day, since its language agrees so exactly with that of our best prayers. It reads: "O God Almighty, who madest the heaven and the earth and the sea and all that is therein, help me, have mercy upon me, wash away my sins, save me in this world and in the world to come, through our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, through whom is the glory and the power forever and ever, Amen."

Nor is this all that gives such unusual importance to these fragments, the chief interest rather being attached to the fact that the papyri show the language of the greater portion of the New Testament to have been that of the common people, of the non-literary Greek-speaking populace in the countries bounding on the Mediterranean. This fact, however, is so important that it must be discussed in a special paper.

The Road to Success, or Self-Improvement.

Rev. F. E. Pasche, Morris, Minn.

XVII. Have Enthusiasm for Your Work.

Let your heart be in your work. Choose your work, plan as skilfully as you can, and put your whole heart into what you are about to do. "The heart giveth grace unto every art," as our Longfellow beautifully remarks.

Your work is material with which to build character and manhood. It is life's school for practical training of the faculties, expanding the mind, and strengthening and developing the intellect. The money you receive for your work is a necessary circumstance of your work, but the larger part of your compensation lies outside the domain of money. The best of all is the opportunity for growth, for development, for mental expansion; the opportunity to become a larger, more efficient man and a better Christian, rich in knowledge and good works. The few dollars of your salary are to this larger pay only as the chips which fly from the sculptor's chisel are to the angel which he is trying to fashion out of the marble.

You can draw from the faithfulness of your work, from its high aim and divine grandeur, from the grand spirit which you bring to it, the high purpose and power which emanates from you in its performance, a recompense so munificent that what your congregation pays you will seem insignificant beside it.

Let us beware of losing our enthusiasm for our work. Never ask, Is it worth while? Indifference never leads armies that conquer. The difference between half a heart and a whole heart makes just the difference between signal defeat and a splendid victory. Let us make the best of everything. The best product of labor is the high-minded workman with an enthusiasm for his

work. Thus the head and the hands may obtain what the heart longs for. Enthusiasm looks circumstances calmly in the face and fights it through. Enthusiasm is irresistible.

If enthusiasm is irresistible in youth, how much more so is it when carried into old age. Tom Scott began the study of Hebrew at eighty-six. Noah Webster studied seventeen languages after he was fifty. Robert Hall learned Italian when past sixty that he might read Dante in the original. With enthusiasm we may retain the youth of the spirit until the hair is silvered. Man does not realize his strength until enthusiasm has once run away with him.

It is, indeed, astonishing how much weight and effect and pathos may be communicated by enthusiasm. In what other way can we account for the fact that some of the profoundest and most scholarly discourses have fallen almost powerless from the lips of their authors, while the same discourse, coming from the lips of another man, has acted like an electric shock, tearing and shattering the heart? The importance of manner and enthusiasm in preaching is illustrated by an anecdote which a theological teacher used to tell of one of his pupils. The latter, after completing his theological studies, passed the first two years of his ministry in colleagueship with his father. When the father preached, the listeners were few; when the son discoursed, the church was flooded. The father's sermons elicited no praise, the son's were loudly applauded, whereat the former became jealous and irritable. At last the son borrowed one of his father's sermons, and on the following Sunday preached it from memory with great emphasis and animation. The hearers were louder than ever in praise of the son, and one remarked, "The old man never in his life preached a sermon equal to that!" — It has been well observed that a discourse delivered by one man becomes an entirely different discourse when delivered from another's lips, and charged with another's spirit. The words are the same; the force and fire that make them thrilling and electric are not the same. A preacher may produce a sermon irresistible in argument, perfect in rhetorical embellishment, and correct in style, but nothing can give it that electric fire which darts through and through an audience, kindling the hearts, save natural feeling expressed with the fervor of enthusiasm.

It is when a writer is so completely carried away with his subject that he cannot help writing that he writes naturally. Then he imparts "bowels of feeling" to the words he uses, and pours into them such a charm, sweetness so penetrating, energy so potent, that

his writings have an effect upon the soul something like that of those illicit pleasures which steal away our taste and intoxicate our reason. What is the human mind, however enriched with acquisitions or strengthened by exercise, unaccompanied by an ardent and sensitive heart? Its light may illumine, but it cannot inspire. It is when the orator's soul is on fire with his theme, and he forgets his audience, forgets everything but his subject, that he really does a great thing. Work becomes play when one is absorbed in a mighty purpose. Could anything be more foolish and short-sighted than to exclude enthusiasm from your work and to allow a morbid sensitiveness to interfere with your advancement and success in life?

Let us recognize the beauty and power of true enthusiasm. The man of feeling acts, realizes, puts forth his complete energies. His earnest and strong heart will not let his mind rest; he is urged by an inward impulse to embody his thoughts; he must have sympathy; he must have results. And the enthusiastic effort will have results.

You must have love and enthusiasm for your work. Your heart must be in it, like that of John Adams, who said: "Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, I give my hand and my heart to this vote [for independence]. May my right hand forget her cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I hesitate or waver. Through the thick gloom of the present I see the brightness of the future. My judgment approves this measure, and my whole heart is in it. All that I have, and all that I am, and all that I hope, in this life, I am now ready here to stake upon it." Stick to the thing and carry it through. Your whole heart must be in it. Believe you were made for the place you fill, and that no one else can fill it as well. Put forth your whole energies. Bring your listener close to you. Be awake, electrify yourself; go forth to the task like a conqueror. If you would triumph, you must persist. Want of constancy is the cause of many a failure. Show me a really great triumph that is not the reward of persistence.

Nothing was ever accomplished by a half-hearted desire. I like the man who faces what he must "with step triumphant and a heart of cheer," who goes to his task with indissoluble ties of interest and affection. A healthful hunger for a great idea is beauty and blessedness on the road of life. It is a grand sight in the world to see a man fired with enthusiasm, enraptured with his work, dominated by a great purpose and one unwavering aim. He is bound to win.

What a sublime spectacle it is to see a man going straight to his goal, cutting his way through difficulties, and surmounting obstacles which dishearten others, as though they were but stepping-stones! Defeat, like a gymnasium, only gives him new power, opposition only doubles his exertions, dangers only increase his courage. No matter what comes to him, he never turns his eye from his goal. He has no time for his troubles; his mind is filled with the greatness and paramount importance of his vocation and its work.

Anything which helps to keep the mind on our work and off our troubles tends to restore harmony throughout the body. It is a ray of sunshine coming to light us up. Let us carry enough sunshine with us to light up others also. Work thrives better in the sunshine, just as plants do, and maybe our smiles will make our fellow-workers happier in their tasks. Most of all, let us smile and look happy for our dear ones in our own home. To these our sunshine means not just the common cheering, but the very warmth of the heart. It is a great thing to form a habit, acquire a reputation, of always talking up and never down, of encouraging and never discouraging, of seeing good things instead of fearing bad ones, and of always being optimistic about everything. Wherever you are, put beauty into your life. Take a cheerful view of everything; encourage hope. A life that has been rightly trained will extract sweetness from everything; it will see beauty everywhere; you will leap to your task as to an exquisite privilege. This will make you love your work, and go at it with an enthusiastic, consecrating spirit.

The supreme test of a Christian is consecration. "One thing thou lackest," said the Master. What did He mean? The entire consecration of all we have and are, the lending of all our gifts and talents to God, and the doing of our work with our whole heart and with a devoted, enthusiastic love. That is the one thing that very many lack.

It is a most pitiful sight to see men drudging through tasks in which they feel no enthusiasm, — doing nothing from the heart. When we consider this, we see the need of standing like true soldiers at the post which the Lord has assigned us. Viewed in this light, no labor that is necessary can be low or sordid.

> A servant with this clause
> Makes drudgery divine:
> Who sweeps a room, as for Thy laws,
> Makes that and the action fine.

XVIII. Slovenly Habits Produce Slovenly Work.

The outer condition of the body is generally regarded as the symbol of the inner. "The apparel oft proclaims the man" (Shakespeare). People whose personal habits are slovenly produce slovenly work. Always be scrupulously neat and clean. The Talmud places cleanliness next to godliness. "Let thy attire be comely, but not costly" (Livy). Simplicity in dress is its greatest charm. It pays well to dress well. "External advantages make us more respected. A man with a good coat upon his back meets with a better reception than he who has a bad one" (Johnson).

Slovenly habits deteriorate a man's work. "He who does not write as well as he can on every occasion will soon form the habit of not writing well on any occasion" (George Ripley). Slovenly habits will hurt your vocation much more than you may imagine. Careless and indifferent habits would soon ruin a millionaire. Everywhere we see the tragic results of such habits: a slighted job, botched work, failure. They have sown their wild oats, and are reaping a terrible harvest.

After slighting your work, after doing a poor job, you are not quite the same man you were before. You have become inferior, you have deteriorated. Your honor is at stake. You may be as polite as ever; but that is not enough. Mere politeness can never be a substitute for moral excellence. A man who slights his work is a false man, and no one can really believe in himself when he is occupying a false position and wearing a mask; when the little monitor within him is constantly saying, "You know you are a fraud, you are not the man you pretend to be." The consciousness of not being genuine, not being what others think him to be, robs a man of power, honeycombs the character, and destroys self-respect and courage.

Do not say to yourself, "I am not paid for doing more work"; for this means a loss of self-respect. You will lose confidence in your ability to succeed; you will always be conscious of the fact that you have done a mean thing, and no amount of juggling with yourself can induce that inward monitor which says "right" to the thing well done and "wrong" to the botched work, to alter its verdict in your favor. There is something within you that you cannot bribe, a divine sense of justice and right that cannot be blindfolded. Nothing will ever compensate you for the loss of self-respect and courage. You may still succeed when others have lost confidence in you, but never when you have lost confidence in

yourself. If you do not respect yourself, if you must doubt your own ability, your career is at an end so far as its upward tendency is concerned.

A man who works simply for his salary, and is actuated by no higher motive, defrauds himself. He is starting out with a heavy handicap, which, if it does not drag him down to failure, will make his burden infinitely greater. He must work all the harder to overcome the handicap. Do not think too much of the amount of your salary. Think rather of the possible salary you can give yourself by increasing your skill, expanding your experience, enlarging and ennobling yourself, and lending great and lasting service to your country and your fellow-men.

The salary is of very little importance to you in comparison with the reputation for integrity and efficiency you have left behind you, and the experience you have gained while earning the salary. These are the great things. No matter how mean and stingy people are, your opportunity for the time is with them, and it rests with you whether you will use it or abuse it, whether you will make of it a stepping-stone or a stumbling-block. The fact is that your present position, your way of doing your work, is the key that will unlock the door above you, the door to some more efficient work. Slighted work, botched work, will never make a key to unlock the door to anything but failure and disgrace.

If you put rotten material and slighted, dishonest, botched work into the foundation, your superstructure will topple. The foundation must be honest, clean, solid, and firm. Those who do not care how they do their work, if they can only get through with it and get their salary for it, pay very dearly for their trifling; they make very sorry figures in life. Regard your work as a great life-school for the broadening, deepening, rounding into symmetry, harmony, beauty, of your God-given faculties, which are uncut diamonds sacredly intrusted to you for the polishing and bringing out of their hidden wealth and beauty. Look upon it as a manhood-builder, a character-builder. Regard the getting-a-living part as a mere incidental as compared with the man-making part of it.

Some deliberately adopt a shirking, do-as-little-as-possible policy, and prefer the consequent arrested development, and thus become small, narrow, and inefficient men, with nothing large or magnanimous, nothing broad, noble, progressive in their nature. Their leadership faculties, their initiative, their planning ability, their ingenuity and resourcefulness, inventiveness, and all the

qualities which make the leader, the large, full, complete man, remain undeveloped. They blight their own growth, strangle their own prospects, and go through life half men instead of complete men — small, narrow, weak men instead of the strong, grand, complete men they might be. But they do their slovenly work grudgingly. The hardest work in the world is that which is grudgingly done. Everywhere we see people who are haunted by the ghosts of poor, dishonest work done in their youth. These covered-up defects are always coming back to humiliate them later, to trip them up, and to bar their progress.

Laziness is the main cause of slovenly work. The worst of all foes to success is sheer, downright laziness. There is no polite synonym for it. Too many are not willing to work. They are lazy. There is no place in this century for the lazy man. He will be pushed to the wall. Laziness is a habit that at first binds a man with silken threads, but later with iron chains. Doing nothing is doing ill. Labor ever will be the inevitable price of everything that is valuable. Goethe said that industry is nine-tenths of genius, and Franklin, that diligence is the mother of good luck. Among the main conditions of failure, H. H. Vreeland, president of the Metropolitan Street Railway Company of New York, in the first place mentions "laziness, and particularly mental laziness."

An idle brain is one of the most dangerous things in the world — nothing deteriorates faster. The mind was made for continual, strong action, systematic, vigorous exercise, and this is possible only when some dominating aim and a great life purpose leads the way. Nature gives us the use of only those faculties which we employ. When we cease to use a faculty or function, it is gradually taken away from us, gradually shrivels and atrophies. Nature gives to him that hath. But she will not let him keep what he does not use. Use or lose is her motto. Every atom we do not utilize this great economist snatches from us. If you put your arm in a sling and do not use it, Nature will remove the muscle almost to the bone, and the arm will become useless; but in exact proportion to your efforts to use it again she will gradually restore what she took away. Put your mind in the sling of idleness or inactivity, and in like manner she will remove your brain, even to imbecility. He that would thus abuse the gifts of God shall find His grace and patience turned into righteous wrath, meting out swift punishment upon his guilty head. God makes no law without affixing a penalty for its violation. Whenever Nature is outraged, she will inflict the pun-

ishment. The bad thing about a little sin is that it refuses to stay little.

We are all inclined to be proud of our strong points while we are sensitive and neglectful of our weaknesses. Yet it is our greatest weakness which measures our real strength. The quality which you put into your work will determine the quality of your life. The habit of insisting upon the best of which you are capable, of always demanding of yourself the highest, never accepting the lowest or second best, no matter how small your remuneration, will make all the difference to you between failure and success.

No one can respect himself or have that sublime energy which makes for high achievement while he puts half-hearted, poor effort into his work. The man who has not learned to put his whole soul into his task, who has not learned the secret of taking the drudgery out of his work by putting his best efforts into it, has not learned the first principles of success.

Let other people do the poor jobs, the botched work, if they will. Keep your standard up. It is a lofty ideal that redeems the life from the curse of commonness and imparts a touch of nobility to the personality.

Pray before work: O Lord, bestow upon me, for the duties to be resumed, prudence, wisdom, understanding, blessing, and success, together with health, so that I not only make a good beginning, but by Thy aid arrive at a profitable close, thus at all times faithfully attending to my duties. To Thee I commend my work. Give success to my projects, and let me accomplish what I undertake. O Lord Jesus, in Thy name and upon Thy word I will cast out my net. O Lord, help me to avert slovenly habits and slovenly work. O Lord, grant success!

I need Thy presence every passing hour:
What but Thy grace can foil the Tempter's power?
Who like Thyself my guide and stay can be?
Through cloud and sunshine, O abide with me!

XIX. The Charm of Personality.

The most important element in an applicant's chances of success on first sight is his personality. Charm of personality is a divine gift. All doors fly open to sunny, pleasing personalities. The power to please is a tremendous asset. If you radiate sweetness and light, people will love to get near you. You havn't the heart to turn away the man with a pleasing personality. There is a charm in a gracious, sunny personality which it is very hard to resist.

Cultivate the art of being agreeable. Lincoln had a passion for helping people, for making himself agreeable under all circumstances. "What thou wilt, thou must rather enforce it with thy smile than hew to it with thy sword" (Shakespeare). Always be polite and courteous. Show a calm spirit and a wise and placid demeanor. Express your sentiments gently, though firmly. Be much larger than anything you say or do. Courtesy is not always found in high places. A fine courtesy is a fortune in itself. Be everywhere polite and affable. The art of pleasing is the art of rising in the world. Men, like bullets, go farthest when they are smoothest. The good-mannered have passports everywhere. Good manners are the kindly fruit of refined nature, and are the open sesame to the best society. Practise good manners also at home. Eat at your own table as you would eat at the table of the President.

Improve the charm of personality by dressing well. Inferiority of garb often induces restraint. God approves of appropriate dress. He has put robes of beauty and glory upon all His works. Every flower is dressed in richness; every field is clothed with a mantle of beauty; every star shines in brightness; every bird is clothed in the most exquisite taste. And surely He is pleased when we provide a beautiful setting for the greatest of His handiworks.

Practise tact. Tact is more than talent. Talent is power, tact is skill. Talent knows *what* to do, tact knows *how* to do it. Never be boisterous and indefinite; be simple and clear. Simplicity is beauty. Simplicity is power. "It is with words as with sunbeams — the more they are condensed, the deeper they burn" (Southey). As the banks and shoals of the sea are the ordinary resting-place of fogs, so it is with thought and language; the cloud almost invariably indicates the shallow. The man of tact, the cautious man, uses words as the rifleman does bullets; he utters but few words, but they go to the mark like a gunshot, and then he is silent again, as if he were reloading.

Cultivate your social side. It is through social intercourse that our rough corners are rubbed off, that we become polished and attractive. Always be frank and open. Secretiveness repels as much as frankness attracts. There is something about the very inclination to conceal or cover up which arouses suspicion and distrust. We cannot long deceive the world. What you say and how you say it, will betray all your secrets, will give the world your true measure.

You must give much if you would be a charming personality.

The more generously you give, the more you will get in return. You must give much in order to get much. "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again." Luke 6, 38.

Cultivate humility of soul. "Let each esteem other better than themselves." Vanity, the opposite of humility, goes strutting through the world seeking honor from men and forgetting God. What a contrast the humble Christian presents! Esteeming others better than himself, he puts his heart in an attitude of worship and praise to the heavenly Father. Christians who honor others often entertain angels unawares; such a spirit invests him who possesses it with a charm and beauty which will always be admired and never forgotten.

If you would be interesting and charming, you must take the trouble to learn to talk well. Develop your powers of conversation. The ability to interest people in your conversation, to hold them, is a great power. Conversation is a training in a perpetual school. It stimulates thought wonderfully. We think more of ourselves if we can talk well, if we can interest and hold others. The power to do so increases our self-respect, our courage.

In order to attract and charm others by your personality, you must be able to control yourself, keep cool and sedate, and avoid all nervousness. Nervous impatience is a conspicuous characteristic of the American people. The charm of the days of chivalry and leisure has almost vanished from our civilization.

Above all, cultivate a pleasant, cheerful disposition. Nothing else influences a man's career in life so much as his disposition. Why does many a man fail of success? He is sour and morose, has a surly temper, is sullen, fretful. He may have capacity, knowledge, and pluck to back him at the start; but it is his disposition that will decide his place in the world at the end. He has some unfortunate, crooked twist of temperament that invites disaster. He is ill-tempered, or conceited, or trifling, or lacks interest in his vocation. Is there no antidote? Is there no remedy?

> Alas! the evil which we fain would shun
> We do, and leave the wished-for good undone;
> Our strength to-day
> Is but to-morrow's weakness, prone to fall;
> Poor, blind, unprofitable servants all
> Are we alway.

XX. The Opportunities for Self-Improvement.

Resolve that you will no longer be handicapped and placed at a disadvantage because of that which you can remedy, because of that which industry may retrieve and integrity may purify. You will find the whole world will be changed for you when you change your attitude. You will be surprised to see how quickly you can very materially improve your mind and memory after you have made a vigorous resolution to do so. Go about it with a firm determination. There is a natural hunger in every normal being for self-expansion, a yearning for growth or enlargement. Beware of stifling this craving of nature for self-development.

The very reputation of always trying to improve yourself, of seizing every opportunity to fit yourself for something better, the reputation of being dead in earnest, determined to become more useful to others and to do something in the world, is of untold assistance to you. People like to help those who are trying to help and to improve themselves. They will throw opportunities in their way. Such a reputation is a good kind of capital to start with.

The world teems with opportunities. They lie all around. There are far more opportunities than men able to embrace them. The biggest opportunity means nothing to the little man; but to the big man the smallest opportunity is the open door to fortune and public service. Oil was a pitiably poor business when Rockefeller first brought his power of organization to bear upon it. Steel had made no millionaires when Carnegie's brain and enterprise made of it an opportunity. Henry Heinz, who made millions and gave noble sums to worthy causes, found his opportunity in the humble pickle. Peter Cooper made his wealth in glue. The two little steel balls that govern or regulate the steam engine brought their inventor millions. The simple invention by which the perforations in postage stamps are made yielded more profit than a gold mine. The silk fiber device in banknote paper brought large monetary returns. New processes of making buttons, pens, and pins have built palaces. Hundreds of men have left enormous fortunes made from relatively insignificant things. These men have developed their chances and opportunities into a good thing by patience, perseverance, energy, and industry. You also have your chances and opportunities. Turn them into a good thing. Develop them for self-improvement. *(To be concluded.)*

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Spiritual Leaders Gone Wrong.

The *New York Evening Mail* of May 6, on page four, brought a most illuminating and sad article on Baptist seminaries. Many Baptist pastors think that their theological schools are unfit to train students for the ministry. Dr. Chas. H. Fountain, of Plainfield, N. J., has issued a pamphlet, *The Denominational Situation,* which renews a controversy going back to 1918, to the beginning of a controversy, and to questions raised in the Baptist press which led to the calling of a conference at Buffalo, last June, and the appointment of a commission of nine to inquire into the teachings of certain of their colleges.

To such as are interested in purity of doctrine and are solicitous for the younger generation, to pastors and laymen really interested in their church, these revelations are astonishingly sad. The Baptist Church has very generally maintained "close communion" in theory and practise. But great inroads have been made in the last decades by rationalists. And we can only hope that the men who are now demanding an accounting of their stewardship from the teachers may not rest till success is achieved.

It was but recently that some prominent Presbyterian writer gave it as his belief that the only church in which the Bible still holds sway as the inspired Word of God, coming with authority in its message, — the only Church, generally speaking, uncontaminated by modern belief, is the Lutheran Church. — *New York Lutheran.*

The Bible and church history teach us that corruption has come into the Church through its spiritual leaders. Some years ago we read that one blind man was leading another blind man, and both were headed for an excavation which had been made in a city street. A stranger seeing the danger of these blind men, asked one of them, "What are you doing?" "I am showing my friend around town," he answered. Christ says, "Can the blind lead the blind? Shall they not both fall into the ditch? The disciple is not above his master." Luke 6, 39. 40.

Let us not say it boastfully, but very humbly, acknowledging the grace of God, that our Lord has for three-quarters of a century preserved unto our Synod purity of doctrine, that He has given us men at our institutions of learning, in our pulpits, and in our church-schools who have adhered to the unerring Word of God and have taught it to their students, their hearers in the churches, and their children in the schools. We have thus far, by the grace of God, kept out error. We have been called narrow, bigoted, uncharitable, unprogressive; but we have retained the old Gospel, and our work, done in the Lord, has not been in vain. Our Synod has grown from 12 congregations and 22 ministers in the year 1847 to 3,283 congregations and 901 preaching-stations, 2,471 active ministers in charge of congregations, 14 synodical institutions of learning (colleges, theological seminaries, and normal schools), 91 professors and 26 assistants,

2,042 students, 623,228 communicant members, and 1,009,982 souls in the year 1921. Our pastors are not preaching to empty churches, and the percentage of men who are members of our churches and who attend our church services is not small. But these figures are only worth considering when we bear in mind that we are still teaching and preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ and are thereby doing the work of the Christian Church upon earth.

In spite of all this, however, we need to hear and heed the Lord's warning, "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Matt. 26, 41. In the measure in which indifferentism, rationalism, and materialism are gaining ground in the church denominations surrounding us, it is becoming increasingly difficult for us to maintain our firm stand for the old Gospel. If we, however, be deprived of any of the blessings which we now enjoy and are permitted to bring to others, it will be entirely our own fault. God desires to retain them for us; and by His grace we shall stand firm. Let us especially ask Him always to give us such spiritual leaders as show us the way of truth. FRITZ.

Luther and Modern Germany.

In an article on "Luther and Education" the *America* says: "The apologists of Martin Luther claim that he made modern Germany. If that be true, we ask in the light of the frightful climax to which Luther-made and Luther-taught Prussia drove the world a few years ago, Are they proud of his work and of the edifice which he erected?"

When ignorant people make such statements as these, we can offer some excuse, but when educated men do so, we cannot give even a satisfactory explanation. They ought to know that the theology taught in modern Germany is not the theology of Luther. It is this very thing which we much deplore, and to which we attribute Germany's downfall. And modern Protestantism as such is also not the fruit of Luther's work. The doctrines and principles which are taught in the theological seminaries of the sects and in their pulpits are not those which Luther taught and which our Lutheran Church teaches to-day. We can rightfully expect that those who would speak with authority at least acquaint themselves with the facts. FRITZ.

Southern Baptist Convention.

The Southern Baptist Convention met at Chattanooga. In a city of only 75,000 white population 7,000 messengers and visitors were cared for by a generous Southern hospitality. Beautiful homes by the hundred were opened to the visitors. The meetings were held in the Billy Sunday tabernacle, having 6,000 numbered seats. Dr. Edgar Y. Mullins, president of the Southern Seminary, was chosen president of the Southern Baptists. The Conservation Commission reported that the magnificent sum of $12,907,843 had been paid in during the year for convention purposes. The Southern Baptists are trying to raise $80,000,000 in five years. The cost of the campaign is said to be negligible, that is, there are no large overhead expenses. The con-

vention represents 3,000,000 people. The convention called upon the President and the Secretary of State to use their influence in favor of disarmament, urged the passage of the Volstead Supplemental Bill to strengthen the enforcement of prohibition, pleaded for the censorship of motion pictures, expressed itself concerning the evil tendencies of the modern dance, lamented the increase of divorce, asked its ministers to educate the young people as to the sanctity and solemnity of marriage, and demanded stricter Sunday laws. The missionary opportunity of Europe was presented as "second to none in the wide world"; Europe was spoken of as a "mission-field looming as large and as black as Asia or Africa." Nearly 200,000 baptisms were reported for the churches of the Southern Baptists during the past year. A campaign for winning souls will be vigorously carried out. Until now women have had no representation by members of their own sex on the boards of the convention. Upon their request women will be added to the boards. FRITZ.

What Are the Fundamentals?

The *Congregationalist* says: "God Himself, as He was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, . . . is the foundation of the Christian religion. Christ is the second Christian fundamental. . . . When a man has an unshaken hold on God and on Christ, as any man may have and many have had and do have, and is striving to regulate his life thereby, he is in possession of the two fundamentals of the Christian religion. Belief in them and the honest purpose to conform one's life to them are all that should be required for church-membership. . . . They are sufficient bases for Christian unity and for Christian union. . . . Within the limits of these fundamentals there is room for different theories of the atonement or of the inspiration of the Scriptures or of the future advent of our Lord. But these two beliefs are the Biblical fundamentals. Other beliefs are important, but they are secondary. Still other beliefs may be justified by a single passage of Scripture or by a class of passages, but ultimately the whole of the Bible wins out against any particularistic teaching within it."

The final analysis of these statements shows that the *Congregationalist* has no fundamentals at all, but believes what it pleases and advises others to do likewise. Certain it is that different theories of the atonement and of the inspiration of the Scriptures can have no place in Christian theology. The kind of religion which the *Congregationalist* "requires for church-membership" is that which is very generally taught in the sectarian churches of our day. It is the religion of Unitarianism and the lodge, but it is not Christianity. FRITZ.

What Does the Fundamentalist Movement Portend?

Under this heading the *Watchman-Examiner* (June, 1921) gives a detailed account of the fundamentalist movement. We read, quoting in part: "First of all, we would like to say a word about the people who constitute the Northern Baptist Convention. From such

evidence as we have been able to gather we have come to the conclusion that four-fifths of our people may be denominated conservatives or evangelicals. Four-fifths of our people hold to the faith of our fathers, believe to-day what all Baptists believed fifty years ago. They believe in the supernatural birth of Christ, in the vicarious, substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, in the bodily resurrection of Christ, and they are looking and praying for the visible return of our Lord according to His promise. But certain educators, organization leaders, and pastors among us who have departed from this simple faith of our fathers have long had the ear of the public and have lost no opportunity to promote liberalism and rationalism. This propaganda has been distasteful to the rank and file of our denomination. False teaching is like leaven in its permeating power. But how could this propaganda of false teaching be met? What is everybody's business is nobody's business. Everywhere men and women talked about the situation. Everybody felt that something must be done, but nobody knew just what to do. These were the circumstances that gave birth to the fundamentalist movement.

"Last year 150 men, pastors and laymen, decided to call at Buffalo a conference on Baptist fundamentals. They were conscious of the fact that they were exposing themselves to criticism and ridicule. They did not need to be told by unfriendly people that they were self-appointed leaders. They knew that. They were willing to suffer for Christ's sake. They felt that the time had come for a reaffirmation of the faith of our fathers. The 150 pastors and laymen who called the Buffalo conference and who with others are promoting the Des Moines conference are not denominational anarchists and fanatics. They have spent a lifetime serving every Baptist cause, and they are all actively cooperating with the Northern Convention. They are loyal Baptists, every one of them, and their only crime is that they have consecrated themselves to reaffirming and reemphasizing the faith of our fathers. In an unofficial way they confidently believe that they speak for an overwhelming majority of our Baptist people.

"The leaders in this movement would be the first to acknowledge their limitations. We are not authorized to speak for them, but we dare to do so nevertheless. Their speech may not always be felicitous, and their judgment is not infallible, but they are willing to die for our time-honored Baptist faith. They invite the great conservative element of our denomination to join them in warfare against rationalism. Let the evangelicals of our denomination arouse themselves to the dangers that threaten our holy faith. Let them fall in with the fundamentalist movement, wash out its impurities, iron out its wrinkles, and make it, or something that will grow out of it, the palladium of our liberties.

"The fundamentalist movement, in giving new emphasis to Christian doctrine, is seeking simply to put first things first. In our day the roots of Christianity are being undermined. While realizing that roots are not trees and foundations are not superstructures, we ought also to realize that to cut the roots and undermine the foundations of Christianity is master strategy on the part of the devil. Such work

is done underground, and too often the Lord's husbandmen and the Lord's builders are unaware of the purpose or even the presence of this hidden and powerful enemy. One of the primary purposes of this fundamentalist movement is to raise the danger signal and to plead with our Baptist people everywhere to contend earnestly for the faith delivered once for all to the saints." MUELLER.

Who Is Responsible for Heresies in the Church?

The *Watchman-Examiner* says in its editorial on the fundamentalist movement: "Let our people stay together, and let the truth prevail. If some of our colleges and seminaries are teaching error, as is commonly reported, it is within the power of our denomination to correct this evil."

It is laudable indeed that there are some among the Baptists who not only know of the deplorable conditions existing in their own denomination, but who also have the courage to voice their conviction. And if it is true that four-fifths among the Baptists hold to the faith of the fathers, then it ought not to be difficult for such a vast majority to assert itself, and, if necessary, put out from among them such as have fallen away from the very fundamentals of Christianity. But will they do it, or will the very spirit of indifferentism which is characteristic of the Reformed churches prompt them to bear with the heretics among them until their heresies have permeated also the four-fifths? The answer is to be given by the Des Moines convention, which is in session while we are writing these lines. We shall report in a later issue.

While it is true that heresies are brought into the Church by the theological schools and the spiritual leaders, it is also true that it is the duty of every Christian in the Church "to try the spirits whether they are of God," and "earnestly to contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." In doing this, Christians are not acting as "self-appointed leaders," but are doing what the Lord Himself in His Word asks them to do. After all, God will hold not only the spiritual leaders in the Church, but also all the members in the Church responsible for the doctrines which are taught. Will the Baptists, the conservative "four-fifths," measure up to their responsibility? FRITZ.

The Evanston Plan of Religious Education.

Various plans for the promotion of religious education have been worked out during the last few years, one of the most prominent being the "Gary Plan," which provided for certain study during the week in connection with the work of the public schools, but supervised by the churches. Two years ago a somewhat different plan was inaugurated by the city of Evanston for the purpose of providing the same instruction, but on a different basis. The public school buildings were rented to the workers from the churches, who were to offer instruction outside of the school hours. The plan seemed to give considerable promise of success, for the teachers employed were highly trained and

thoroughly competent. They were being paid a salary for their work, which assured high-grade service. The results have not been altogether satisfactory, however. In the first place, it has been a difficult matter to finance. The parents have objected to this "lengthening of the day," and the attendance of the children has fallen off. There has been a feeling that the management was too far removed from the "control" of the churches. — *Northwestern Christian Advocate.*

Realizing the need of more religious instruction for the youth of our land, educators are trying one scheme and then another. Our system of parochial schools solves the problem. Do we fully and always appreciate this fact? FRITZ.

Results of True Education.

In the *Christian Herald* (June, 1921) Dr. Charles M. Sheldon defines education as "the development, in every right direction, of all the powers of the human being for the purpose of using those powers to make a better world," and mentions among the results of this kind of education the following qualities of head and heart (we are quoting in part): —

The first result of a true education is a deep sense of *humility.* We were born into a very great world, and we can never learn very much about it. The last thing in the world that a student should entertain, is a spirit of pride. The wisest people know very little compared with the vast amount of knowledge to be acquired. There is no such thing as finishing one's education. We may be graduated from a school or college, but never from the university of experience. True humility is the first result of a true education, and by it we will understand an open mind, hungry and eager for new truth and large truth. There is no one in the world who cannot teach some one else a lesson or impart some knowledge.

"The second great result of true education is a *love for hard work.* Those who do things for the world, which need to be done, are not watching either the clock or the pay envelope all the time. The work which they are doing is greater than what they get for it, if it is worth doing at all. When the day's work becomes drudgery or monotony, the very heart of service is gone. Every one has the experience of growing tired in doing the day's work, but one should not grow tired in outdoing it if it is necessary for the world's happiness that it should be done. Real education puts into the heart and mind a joy in using the gifts of mind or the strength of the body. No man is truly educated who works his way through the world without the real joyous feeling in the day's labor.

"The third result of true education is a *clean life.* A truly educated man or woman cannot have bad habits. There are men and women who have been to schools and universities, who have articles of culture in their homes, who have traveled around the world, but who have vicious habits of mind and body. I would not call such people educated. A truly educated person must be wholesome, must think straight and live straight. Conduct and intellectuality must go hand

in hand, or there is something wrong with the entire thing called education.

"The fourth result of a true education is *high ideals.* The first thing that the average man does is to sneer at ideals. He says they will not work in the markets, and they will not go in politics. What he means by that is that sometimes if one acts from the highest motives, he may lose money or fail to get elected to an office. The high ideals that one carries into business or politics will not be carried in there unless they are formed during the period of education. A student who cheats in his examinations will cheat in his business or political life, and no man is truly educated who cheats, and no man is truly educated who has no ideals in the making of money or in the holding of power.

"The fifth result of a true education is an *independent spirit.* Educated people who are truly educated according to our definition will do things which other people will not do. One of the greatest tests of an educated man or woman is the test of putting them into difficult positions and challenging them with seeming impossibilities. Where an uneducated person would fail or cowardly run away, an educated person will remain and wrest victory out of defeat. The mark of independence is the quality which has made reformers, and it would be a very poor world without them.

"Another mark of a truly educated life is a *sense of brotherhood.* I may be a citizen of the State of New York or of Kansas, so far as my birthplace or citizenship or voting place is concerned, but I am also a citizen of the whole world. No one is truly educated who has race prejudice or hates other people because they belong to another nationality, or who is indifferent to the troubles of other people because they do not live in his block. Every really educated person has a feeling of sympathy for all the people in the wide world, and it is absolutely impossible for him to hate, or despise, or be indifferent to, any other human being.

"The last great result of a true education, and the best of all, is *religious convictions.* Every truly educated person in the world must have a religious life. There is no such thing as true education without true religion. By religion I do not mean going to church, subscribing to certain articles of creeds, or wearing certain kinds of clothing. I mean what Jesus meant when He said: 'We must love God, and our neighbor as ourselves.' That is religion in the highest sense, and no college training, no book learning, no linguistic gifts, no travel, no culture, can take the place of a love of God and man. There are a good many pagans walking around in this world under the guise of educated people. They are not educated unless they have the great basic foundation in life of the creed of the Master. Education without religion is a farce and a failure. If the schools and colleges do not teach the great fundamentals of conduct and of the right relations of men to their neighbors, of common justice and honor in the market-place, of an absence of race feeling and prejudice, if they do not teach peace instead of war, and love instead of hate,

and service instead of self, they are pagan institutions with no right to an existence, and the tax-payers' money is wasted upon them. If they do not teach conduct and character, they are pagan and not Christian."

While the above is, in general, a fine statement of what true education should accomplish, we beg leave to take issue with it on several points. A definition of true education must take into account more than this present life. Hence true education is something far greater than "the development of all the powers of the human being for the purpose of using those powers to make a better world." True education reaches beyond this life into eternity, and seeks to establish the right relation between sinful man and the holy God through faith in Christ Jesus as the only foundation upon which to build conduct and character and everything that is good and praiseworthy. Here is the point where Christian education — and that we believe is true education — differs from every education that is essentially pagan. Without faith in Christ there are no true religious convictions, just as little as there is true love of God and our neighbor without sanctification by the Spirit through faith. Every discussion of the subject only serves to show how wide is the chasm between an education primarily based upon God's Word, and one that is not. MUELLER.

Religious Education? Yes and No.

The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* of June 8 says that Dr. Walter S. Athearn, in discussing "Spiritual Illiteracy in the United States," recites the startling facts respecting the small percentage of American children and youth who are in any way connected with the enterprises of religious instruction conducted by the churches, and takes the Sunday-school to task because it "has not developed an adequate body of teaching material," and has "meager equipment and inadequate support." It then says that our duty is clearly to quicken and enlighten the conscience of the Church in favor of the religious education of its children.

Very true. But we answer the question as to religious education both with yes and no. If the kind of religion which is preached from many sectarian pulpits of our day, namely, that Christianity consists in no more than a mere outward moral righteousness, shall enter into the religious education of the children of the land, then the sectarian churches had better save their efforts in this direction. We are heartily in favor of the religious education of children, but only when such religious education calls for the teaching of the Word of God, by means of which alone true religion can be imparted and souls saved.

Before taking up the question as to the religious education of the youth, the sectarian churches of our day had better first purify their churches by putting those men out of their pulpits and out of their theological seminaries who are not only spreading false doctrine, but who no longer preach Christ, the Son of God and the Savior of sinners. Why make also the children drink the foul water which is flowing from these sources? FRITZ.

Concerning the Millennium.

In concluding an article on "The New Testament on the Second Coming of Christ" A. T. Robertson, a noted preacher and scholar in the Baptist Church, having set forth the New Testament teachings on Christ's second coming, says: "Such in epitome is the teaching of the New Testament concerning the second coming of Christ. If we believe what the New Testament teaches, we should also cherish a lively hope for the second coming of our Lord. But Jesus was silent concerning the time and manner of His coming. So are all the writers of the New Testament silent. But we should be ready and eager for His coming. Meanwhile we are to carry on the work of evangelization to the ends of the earth. The world program of Christ is laid upon us by Him. Our duty is to push that with the vigor in our power. We must leave times and seasons to God, who orders the universe.

"I have said nothing about the millennium because *the New Testament has nothing concerning the millennium* save in one chapter in the Apocalypse of John (chapter 20), and no one knows what is meant by the thousand years nor the relation of that symbolic period to the second coming of Christ. *It is a pity for us to obscure the great and blessed promise of the personal return of Christ by discussions about the millennium since we really know nothing clear about that.*"

In the same issue of the paper in which this article appears Edward B. Pollard also writes: "One of the most figurative and uncertain passages in this highly obscure and symbolic book is that in chapter 20, which is alone in speaking of a thousand-year reign (millennium), in which 'the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus,' those that had 'not worshiped the beast,' nor bowed before the Roman emperor's image reigned with Christ a thousand years. It is not said whether these 'souls' are to be embodied, or disembodied, nor where this reign takes place, though some confidently affirm it will be in the flesh and on the earth. Nor does the passage say anything about the 'saints' in general reigning with Christ, but only the martyrs who were beheaded and had not bowed to Caesar's image. Any sort of millennialism stands or falls on a literal interpretation of this passage. And as Dr. Weston used to say, 'I don't know much about the millennium, but I do know it is unsafe to build a system of interpretation of the whole Bible on your interpretation of a single passage in one book and that the most difficult book in the Bible!' A thousand years in the Bible is an indefinite stretch of time. The writer was encouraging a hard-pressed Christian brotherhood to hold firm to their faith through all their fiery trials, being assured that, though beheaded, they, in God's own time, would enter into the privileges and joys of the victorious and reigning Christ. To have informed these glorified martyrs that they would be sent back to earth to live in the flesh for a literal thousand years and then the devil would be set loose again would, I fancy, have had but a poor and melancholy sound to their sainted ears. In fact, in this vision in which the thousand-year reign with Christ is mentioned

(Rev. 20, 1—6), Christ's coming is not once mentioned, nor is there any hint that the scene there described is to be on the earth, nor any reference to any saints present in the scene, except certain martyred ones. *To build up a definite scheme of millennial hopes upon so indefinite a revelation; to talk of pre and post, "before" and "after" a millennium so insecurely fixed as this is to court a confusion of tongues."* MUELLER.

What Is Christianity?

In answering this question, the *Presbyterian* (June 2, 1921) says in part: "With the total historical manifestation of Christianity before us — with a New Testament in one hand and a history of the Christian Church in the other — we are dull of understanding if we do not perceive that Christianity is a *specific* religion, that it is a *redemptive* religion, that it is *that particular redemptive religion that offers salvation through the expiatory death of Jesus Christ.* As Dr. Warfield put it: 'Christianity is a redemptive religion, having as its fundamental presupposition the fact of sin, felt both as guilt and as pollution, and offering as its central good, from which all other goods proceed, salvation from sin through an historical expiation wrought by the God-man Jesus Christ. The essence of Christianity has always been to its adherents the sinner's experience of reconciliation with God through the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ.... No doubt, parties have from time to time arisen who have wished to construe Christianity otherwise. But they have always occupied a place on the periphery of the Christian movement, and have never constituted its main stream.'

"Modern liberalism admits that this is what Christianity has all but universally meant to its adherents. It maintains, however, that almost its entire historical manifestation has been a departure from type, that the 'religion of Jesus' was immediately after His death transformed by the 'faith of the primitive community,' and this in turn by the theological constructions of Paul; so that it is Paulinism rather than Christianity with which church history concerns itself, since it is only recently, thanks to 'Liberalism,' that true Christianity has been recovered. A sounder scholarship, however, has abundantly shown the untenableness of this representation of early church history. There is no such line of cleavage between Paul and the primitive Christians, or between the primitive Christians and Jesus. In the mind of Jesus as well as in the minds of the primitive Christians, and in the minds of the primitive Christians as well as in the mind of Paul, the religion that He founded is a redemptive religion centering in the cross as an atoning sacrifice.

"We may, or we may not, like such a religion. We may accept it, or we may reject it. We may regard it as rational or irrational. We may think it moral or immoral. We may value it as our chief treasure, or we may regard it as without value, or even as a thing to be gotten rid of because positively harmful. Be our judgment of it what it may, true or false, valuable or worthless, it is utterly futile, however, to deny that this is the sort of religion Christianity, as a matter of fact, is."

What the *Presbyterian* here points out is certainly true. And only as long as Christians continue to hold to Christianity "as that particular redemptive religion that offers salvation through the expiatory death of Jesus Christ" are they able to combat and repel the lying deceits of modern liberalism. The issue implies that they cling to every iota of Gospel-truth. Otherwise their fight is futile.

MUELLER.

Faith and Charity.

The St. Louis *Christian Advocate* (June, 1921) thus commends the action of Chinese students under Christian teaching during the recent famine in China: "To the earnest Christians of America who have made it possible for our missionaries to carry the Gospel of Christ into far places, one of the most heartening messages to come out of China is that which tells us of the self-sacrificing service, in behalf of the starving famine victims, rendered by the native college and high school students who have come under the influence of our Christian workers. Those from the colleges were quick to volunteer, and they proved themselves dependable and untiring relief workers. Later, when temporary schools were established in famine villages, in the general plan of the relief organizations to save as many children as possible from the ravages of the famine, high school students offered their services. They have been working without charge in schools in which the pupils have to be fed as well as taught. Beginning as teachers and helpers, these high school lads, in many instances, have come to have almost entire charge of the famine schools, as those originally in authority have been called to other relief work. And their unselfish devotion to the little unfortunates under their care furnishes one of the most inspiring examples of the result of Christian teaching."

It has always been thus. Faith in Christ worketh love. So, in some hour of need, even men who have scoffed at missions and ridiculed the thought of changing the hearts of idol worshipers through the Gospel of Christ, find out, to their great rejoicing, that the preaching of God's Word among the heathen is not in vain. MUELLER.

"Christian Science."

The *Christian Science Sentinel* of April 16, 1921, p. 643, says: "Every word written by Mrs. Eddy and left as a part of her divine mission was inspired and controlled by divine authority. In other words, every word is divinely authorized." With a sweep of the pen so-called Christian Science sets aside God and the Bible, and puts Mrs. Eddy and her writings in their place. That the so-called Christian Scientists altogether disregard the Bible is apparent from all their teachings. The April issue of the *Christian Science Journal* has the following: "The material universe and all that it contains, including mortal man, is a dream or illusion; its states of being are never real or absolute, but are always states of belief, at times seemingly better or worse, but always erroneous. . . . When Christ stood before the tomb of Lazarus, He knew that Lazarus, as the spiritual

child of God, had never died; but He knew also that Lazarus as a material man had never lived; and His clear knowledge of the absolute truth about Lazarus changed the belief of the people from a belief of Lazarus dead to a belief of Lazarus living, both of which were merely beliefs of mortal mind."

John 11, 13. 14 we read: "Howbeit Jesus spake of his death. . . . Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." And Martha said unto the Lord: "Lord, by this time he stinketh, for he hath been dead four days." V. 39. And John 12, 9 we read: "They came not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom He had raised from the dead." So-called Christian Science does not believe in death; consequently not in sin, by which death was brought into this world; consequently also not in the need of a Savior, who has redeemed us from sin and death. Why does Christian Science persist in calling itself Christian when in its system it has not a vestige of Christian truth left? It is simply another case where the devil transforms himself into an angel of light to deceive the unwary.

FRITZ.

A Warning to Ministers.

Speaking editorially, the *Congregationalist* says: "Ministers cannot be too careful about entering upon courses of action that will put them into a false position and lead others into a financial morass." It is bad enough when ministers yield to the temptation of making poor investments of the little money which they may have, but still worse it is when they let themselves be persuaded to commend certain business projects and induce their brother ministers or the members of their church and of other churches to invest their money in a losing proposition. People believe that a business scheme recommended by a minister must be sound. It will, however, not add to the dignity of his office nor to the confidence which people ought to put in him, if a minister lets himself be used as a financial agent; and no amount of good intentions will help him very much with his people, if through his fault they have lost money in a business venture, which, perhaps, from the very beginning had been unsound or even a swindle. A word to the wise is sufficient.

FRITZ.

BOOK REVIEW.

Mission Studies. *Edward Pfeiffer, D. D.* Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 469 pp., 5½×8. Third, revised and enlarged edition. $2.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Professor Pfeiffer of Capital University (Ohio Synod) at Columbus offers valuable material to the student of missions, as can readily be seen from the table of contents: I. The Historical Background of the Missionary Enterprise; II. Missionary Principles in General, with Particular Application to Foreign Missions; III. Home and Inner Mission-work; IV. The Nurture of Missionary Life in the Home Church. In two appendices he

gives outlines of courses for mission study classes and reading circles, and a bibliography. We do not hesitate to say that the reading of Prof. Pfeiffer's book will be well worth the money and the time spent on it.

FRITZ.

A Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible, with Introduction to Old Testament Literature, a Pronouncing Dictionary of Scripture Proper Names, Tables of Weights and Measures, and an Index to the Entire Bible. *Rev. Robert Jamieson, D. D., Rev. A. R. Fausset, A. M., Rev. David Brown, D. D.* 1370 pages, large octavo. (George H. Doran Co., New York.) $7.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The popular demand, apparently growing, for one-volume commentaries on the whole Bible has so far been supplied for English readers exclusively by British scholars of the Reformed type of theology, or of the modern school of negative Bible criticism. *Peake's Commentary* is the most radical in this class; *Dummelow's* is more conservative; and the present *J. F. & B.'s Commentary* is advertised as "a standard evangelical work." In its present form it is evidently a reprint, and the blurred and defective typography in places indicate that old plates have been used. Some of our readers probably remember this commentary in its original four-volume edition, for which Jamieson, of St. Paul's, Glasgow, Scotland, had treated Genesis to Esther; Fausset, of St. Cuthbert's, York, England, Job to Malachi; Brown, Professor of Theology at Aberdeen, Scotland, Matthew to Romans; and Fausset again, Corinthians to Revelation. This four-volume edition had such an immense sale that "the plates became literally worn out from the printing of so many editions." A later print in two large octavo volumes ran through many editions. "Now these two volumes have been combined in one by the employment of a very thin, but good quality of paper." The *J. F. & B. Commentary*, then, is not, like *Dummelow's* and *Peake's*, an entirely new work, written to meet present needs. Moreover, its composite authorship does not give it the absolute uniformity of its two British companion publications. However, this feature is the least disturbing of all in this book, as there exists a remarkable unity of sentiment and method among the three authors.

Nearly one-half of this commentary is devoted to the exposition of the New Testament (605 pages, to 726 for the Old Testament). The partiality thus shown for the New Testament has the best of reasons to commend it, and will be generally approved. In the Old Testament the treatment given to the Psalms (43 pages) is out of proportion to that given to Job (36 pages). 76 pages have been devoted to Isaiah, 60 to Jeremiah (including Lamentations), 52 to Ezekiel, and 28 to Daniel. All the minor prophets are treated on less than 100 pages. — In the New Testament there are 59 pages devoted to Matthew, 30 to Mark, 32 to Luke, 44 to John, 46 to Acts, 38 to Romans, 58 to Corinthians, 16 to Galatians, 17 to Ephesians, 9 to Philippians, 12 to Colossians, 15 to Thessalonians, 32 to the pastoral epistles, 1½ to Philemon, 42 to Hebrews, 11 to James, 24 to Peter, 14 to John, 4 to Jude, and 57 (!) to Revelation. This enumeration is no attempt to measure intellectual and spiritual values by mechanical units, but it is to enable our readers to form some opinion of the distribution of explana-

tory matter in this book, and relate that to their own experience of the amount of comment needed in specific instances. In a book of this kind space is an essential matter, and disproportion in this respect has the same effect as a false emphasis in speech.

Special pains have been taken with the introductory material, 32 pages of which have been devoted to the Old Testament, and 40 to the New. In the Old Testament section there are introductory articles given at the beginning of the volume to the Pentateuch and the historical books, to the poetical books, to the prophetical books, and to the prophets of the Restoration. Besides these, there are special introductions for each book from Job to Malachi. In the New Testament each book is given a special introduction. These 72 pages of introductions are an isagogics *in nuce;* they are marvels of condensation, each article packed full of facts, and pressed down. We note some of the judgments expressed: "The Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch is established by the concurring voices both of Jewish and Christian tradition; and their unanimous testimony is supported by the internal character and statements of the work itself. . . . But admitting that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, an important question arises as to whether the books which compose it have reached us in an authentic form; whether they exist genuine and entire as they came from the hand of their author. In answer to this question, it might be sufficient to state that, in the public and periodical rehearsals of the Law in the solemn religious assemblies of the people, implying the existence of numerous copies, provision was made for preserving the integrity of 'The Book of the Law.' But besides this, two remarkable facts, the one of which occurred before and the other after the captivity, afford conclusive evidence of the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch. The first is the discovery in the reign of Josiah of the autograph copy which was deposited by Moses in the ark of the testimony, and the second is the schism of the Samaritans, who erected a temple on Mount Gerizim, and who, appealing to the Mosaic Law as the standard of their faith and worship equally with the Jews, watched with jealous care over every circumstance that could affect the purity of the Mosaic records. There is the strongest reason, then, for believing that the Pentateuch, as it exists now, is substantially the same as it came from the hands of Moses. The appearance of a later hand, it is true, is traceable in the narrative of the death of Moses at the close of Deuteronomy, and some few interpolations, such as inserting the altered names of places, may have been made by Ezra, who revised and corrected the version of the ancient Scriptures. But substantially the Pentateuch is the genuine work of Moses, and many who once impugned its claims to that character, and looked upon it as the production of a later age, have found themselves compelled, after a full and unprejudiced investigation of the subject, to proclaim their conviction that its authenticity is to be fully relied on. — The genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch being admitted, the inspiration and canonical authority of the work follow as a necessary consequence." (p. 5 f.) This is quite satisfactory; but it is necessary to examine at once what, in the view of the authors, constitutes inspiration. We turn to 2 Tim. 3, 16: "All Scripture — *Greek,* 'Every Scripture,' *i. e.,* Scripture in its every part. However, *English Version* is sustained, though the Greek article be wanting, by the

technical use of the term 'Scripture' being so notorious as not to need the article (cf. *Greek*, Eph. 3, 15; 2, 21). The *Greek* is never used of *writings* in general, but only of the sacred Scriptures. The position of the two *Greek* adjectives closely united by 'and,' forbids our taking the one as an epithet, the other as predicated and *translated* as ALFORD and ELLICOTT, 'Every Scripture given by inspiration of God is *also* profitable.' *Vulgate*, in the best MSS., favors *English Version*. Clearly the adjectives are so closely connected that as surely as one is a predicate, the other must be so too. ALFORD admits his *translation* to be harsh, though legitimate. It is better with *English Version* to take it in a construction legitimate, and at the same time *not harsh*. The *Greek* 'God-inspired' is found nowhere else. Most of the New Testament books were written when Paul wrote this his latest Epistle: so he includes in the clause, 'All Scripture is God-inspired,' not only the *Old Testament*, in which alone Timothy was taught when a child (v. 15), but the New Testament books according as they were recognized in the churches which had men gifted with 'discerning of spirits,' and so able to distinguish really inspired utterances, persons, and so their writings, from spurious. St. Paul means 'All Scripture is God-inspired *and therefore* useful'; because *we* see no utility in any words or portion of it, it does not follow that it is not God-inspired. It is *useful* because *God-inspired*, not *God-inspired* because useful. One reason for the article not being before the *Greek*, 'Scripture,' may be that, if it had, it might be supposed that it limited the sense to the *hiera grammata*, 'Holy Scriptures' (v. 15), *of the Old Testament*, whereas here the assertion is more general: *'all* Scripture' (cf. *Greek*, 2 Pet. 1, 20). The *translation*, 'all Scripture that is God-inspired is also useful,' would imply that there is some *Scripture* which is not God-inspired. But this would exclude the appropriated sense of the word 'Scripture'; and who would need to be told that 'all divine Scripture is *useful*' ('profitable')? Heb. 4, 13 would, in ALFORD'S view, have to be rendered, 'All naked things are *also* open to the eyes of Him,' etc.: so also 1 Tim. 4, 4, which would be absurd. KNAPP well defines inspiration, 'An extraordinary divine agency upon teachers whilst giving instruction, whether oral or written, by which they were taught how and what they should speak or write' (cf. 2 Sam. 23, 1; Acts 4, 25; 2 Pet. 1, 21). The *inspiration* gives the divine *sanction* to all the words of Scripture, though those words be the utterances of the individual writer, and only in special cases *revealed* directly by God (1 Cor. 2, 13). *Inspiration* is here predicated of the *writings*, 'all Scripture,' not of the persons. The question is not *how* God has done it; it is as to the *word*, not the men who wrote it. What we must believe is that He *has* done it, and that all the sacred writings are everywhere inspired, though not all alike matter of special *revelation;* and that even the very *words* are stamped with Divine sanction, as Jesus used them (*ex. gr.*, in the temptation, and John 10, 34. 35) for deciding all questions of doctrine and practise. There are degrees of *revelation* in Scripture, but not of *inspiration*. The sacred writers did not even always know the full significancy of their own God-inspired words (1 Pet. 1, 10—12). Verbal inspiration does not mean mechanical dictation, but 'all Scripture is (so) inspired by God,' that everything in it, its narratives, prophecies, citations, the whole — ideas, phrases, and words — are such as He saw fit to be there.

The *present condition* of the text is no ground for concluding against the *original text* being inspired, but is a reason why we should use all critical diligence to restore the original inspired text. Again, inspiration may be accompanied by revelation or not, but it is as much needed for writing *known* doctrines or facts authoritatively as for communicating *new* truths. [TREGELLES.] The omission here of the substantive verb is, I think, designed to mark that not only the Scripture *then* existing, but what was *still to be written till the canon should be completed*, is included as *God-inspired*." (p. 427.) This quotation, which serves at the same time as a fair sample of the form and quality of the comment, is so far superior to what one reads nowadays on this subject that one is inclined to condone the defects, such as the lack of distinction in Knapp's definition between inspiration as it applies to the spoken discourse and in their capacity as writers of God's Word, also the authors' dread of the much-travestied "dictation theory," and the omission of any remark on the *impulsus scribendi*.

The Christological standpoint of the authors can be fairly seen in their remarks on Phil. 2, 7: "MADE HIMSELF OF NO REPUTATION, AND . . . AND — rather as the *Greek*, '*Emptied* Himself, *taking* upon Him the form of a servant, *being* made in the likeness of men.' The two latter clauses (there being no conjunctions, 'and — and,' in the *Greek*) expresses in what Christ's 'emptying of Himself' consists, *viz.*, in 'taking the form of a servant' (*note*, Heb. 10, 5; cf. Ex. 21, 5. 6 and Ps. 40, 6, proving that it was at the time when He assumed a *body*, He took 'the form of a servant'), and in order to explain *how* He took 'the form of a servant,' there is added, by 'being made in the likeness of men.' His subjection to the Law (Luke 2, 21; Gal. 4, 4) and to His parents (Luke 2, 51), His low state as a carpenter, and carpenter's reputed son (Matt. 13, 55; Mark 6, 3), His betrayal for the price of a bond-servant (Ex. 21, 32), and slavelike death to relieve us from the slavery of sin and death; finally and chiefly, *His servantlike dependence as man on God*, whilst His divinity was not outwardly manifested (Is. 49, 37), are all marks of His 'form as a servant.' This proves (1) He was in the form of a servant as soon as He was made man. (2) He was 'in the form of God' *before* He was 'in the form of a servant.' (3) He did as really subsist in the divine nature as in the form of a servant or in the nature of man. For He was as much 'in the form of God' as 'in the form of a servant'; and was so in the form of God as 'to be on an equality with God': He therefore could have been none other than God; for God saith, 'To whom will ye liken Me and make Me equal' (Is. 46, 5)? [BISHOP PEARSON.] His *emptying Himself* presupposes His previous *plenitude of Godhead* (John 1, 14; Col. 1, 19; 2, 9). He remained full of this; yet He bore Himself as if He were *empty*." (p. 363.) This again is a quite satisfactory statement on the *kenosis*, except that one might wish to see it stated that while the incarnation and the humiliation coincide in point of time, they are not identical. Altogether one finds in this one-volume commentary so much gratifying, reliable, correct interpretation, tersely and succinctly expressed, that for quick use this volume is the best commentary for Christians that still occupy the old conservative orthodox position in matters of faith. As regards condensation of valuable information, the authors are very masters. — To add a few strictures to our foregoing remarks is all the more necessary

because of the generally trustworthy comments of the authors. Their remarks on the water-spirit baptism in John 3, 6 are weak. On John 6, on the sermon at the synagog at Capernaum, there occurs this remark: "(It should be added that although this discourse has nothing to do with the Sacrament of the Supper, the Sacrament has everything to do with it, as the *visible embodiment* of these figures, and, to the believing partaker, a *real*, yea, and the most lively and affecting participation of His flesh and blood, and nourishment thereby of the spiritual and eternal life, here below.)" (p. 140.) To the Reformed this statement is not satisfactory, but neither does the Lutheran see his way clear to endorse it because of the vagueness of the relation still assumed between this discourse of the Lord and the Sacrament of the Supper. In Col. 2, 16 the authors take a stand against the abrogation of the Old Testament Sabbath. (p. 378.) In Rev. 20 a reign of "Christ with His transfigured saints over men in the flesh" is taught, and the term "souls" in v. 5 is misinterpreted. — In conclusion, we note that the "Index to the Entire Bible," which is promised in the title of this book, is a sad misnomer. The "Index" is nothing but a running table of contents, — or has the "Index" been omitted? D.

Personal Evangelism among Students. *George Stewart, Jr.*, and *Henry B. Wright.* Association Press, 347 Madison Ave., New York. 79 pp., 6½×4½. $1.00.

This booklet deals with the problem of the student, to whom, in a specific sense, may be applied Henry van Dyke's description of the boy, "our hardest problem and our brightest hope." The authors have in mind, not any special class of students, but all students. They mean to be helpful to these in an evangelical way. Members of college and university faculties will find some facts worth considering and some hints worth heeding in this booklet.

Speaking of academic freedom without supervision, the authors rightly say: "If students are left to themselves, the results are apt to be disastrous in the extreme. To allow men the enjoyment of new privileges with no understanding of their proper use is a hazardous experiment. The student, only recently freed from supervision [of the preparatory school], drinks long and deep of the new freedom, which he is too apt to regard as a right and not a responsibility." While the young men who are attending colleges and universities should not be treated as if they were still boys attending an elementary school, yet the very fact that they are students, who are to be trained by their instructors, demands that they should not be without supervision and guidance. "'They yield with the certainty of gravitation to personal influence.' In the hour of liberty heading towards license, there is but one form of guidance which students will accept. But this, if it be genuine, they rarely refuse. It is the contagion of another's personality working through the processes of friendship." "A class of students is essentially what its teachers and leaders are." Instructors and leaders in education should be able to say with Paul, the authors tell us: "Be ye imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ."

Many a young man has gone through a college or a university and has, to his own regret in later years, learned comparatively little because he did

not make use of the opportunities which were given him. Therefore it is well to be reminded that "hard, honest, consistent study is essential to the building of the best type of character on our school and college campuses. We fail to accomplish the task of propagating genuine Christianity as long as we justify habitual unfaithfulness in the main business of schools and colleges, namely, preparation for the classroom exercises."

Speaking of group consciousness, the authors say: "In contrast to individualism, students possess a gregariousness, a group consciousness, which one must also take into account. The power of tradition" — we speak of it as *usus* — "is upon nearly every one. Bad traditions are established as easily as good ones. In four years, a college generation, a bad tradition can be formed, and in nearly the same length of time a good tradition can become atrophied. One who would understand the life of a given college or school will do well to search into these inarticulate, informal, unconscious influences that exist in the *mores*. These are the principal governing factors. To sow ideas that take root in a college body and grow into tradition that makes for fairness and decency and justice on the campus, is one of the greatest contributions which one can make to the student life of to-day."

Any school is what its teacher makes of it. "The teacher is ultimately responsible for the final product of a school or college." "Let any one who is placed in a position of spiritual leadership examine himself, for his work will rarely result in anything higher than his own spiritual level."

FRITZ.

The Vacation Religious Day-School. Teacher's Manual of Principles and Programs. *Hazel Straight Stafford.* The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Ave., New York. 160 pp., 8×5½. $1.00; by mail, $1.10.

In an editorial note printed in this book we are told that "back of the rapidly increasing popularity of the idea of the daily vacation school of religion are the convictions that — First: The Sunday-schools, because of their many limitations, cannot carry the full responsibility for the religious training of the children and youth of America. In addition to their highly important work there will be required a substantial program of week-day religious instruction. Secondly: The responsibility for this week-day religious instruction cannot rest upon the public school boards, but it does rest upon the churches of the community. Thirdly: In view of the constitutional provision for the separation of Church and State and of the guarantee of religious freedom to all, week-day religious instruction must be conducted, necessarily, upon a voluntary basis and without the use of public funds."

Very true. But why have these schools for week-day religious instruction periods only during vacation? It is better, of course, than to be satisfied merely with a Sunday-school. But, after all, can the Church supply the religious needs of the children with the Sunday-school plus the vacation religious day-school? Our Church has long ago answered this question by establishing its parochial schools, in which, besides the usual branches of learning which are taught in the public school, the Christian religion is daily taught throughout the whole school-year. Even Mrs. Stafford says that the vacation religious day-school, for which she has written her book,

"does not claim to be a panacea for all religious ills, neither the last word in religious education."

While we heartily agree both with the editor and with the author of the book that week-day religious instruction is a necessity, we cannot agree with them that the purpose of religious day-schools should be "*to instruct the children in fundamental religious values common to all denominations,*" nor can we agree that "if religious training is to be universal for our country, it must be organized and maintained *by all the churches acting together.*" With such a purpose in view, however, Mrs. Stafford has written her book of principles and programs for a vacation religious day-school. Mrs. Stafford proposes that a religion be taught which will satisfy the members of the various Protestant churches in a community. What kind of religion she has in mind we can learn from such a remark as this: "Care should be taken by the teacher to paint a vivid, attractive picture of Christ, the man hero, which will inspire the class with a new zeal to study His life. *Christ as a 'Man of Sorrows' does not appeal to young folk.* [Italics our own.] Christ as a 'Humorist,' 'Story-teller,' 'The Alert,' 'The Observer,' 'The Scourger,' makes a tremendous appeal." (p. 126.) We admit that Christ as the "Man of Sorrows" does not appeal to young folk nor to old folk, but the crucified Savior is *needed* by both young and old, for without Him there can be no salvation. A religion which leaves out Christ, the "Man of Sorrows," leaves out the very heart of the Christian religion and ceases to be the religion which alone can save man from sin, death, and hell. Mrs. Stafford's vacation-school religion is also characterized when, in her "Synthetic Survey of Biblical Material," p. 157, she classifies the story of the creation, of Adam and Eve, of the Garden of Eden, of Cain and Abel, of Noah, the ark, and the Flood as belonging to that period which she calls "the prehistoric period of legendary age."

In the preface Mrs. Stafford tells us that the establishment of an effective religious day-school for children was some years ago "a difficult work since the principle of interdenominational cooperation had not yet been concluded by the churches, and the idea of week-day religious instruction was deemed unnecessary, if not heretical." Now evidently the conditions have changed; the churches are beginning to admit that the children need more religious instruction than has until now been given them in the Sunday-school; but at the same time the sectarian churches have resorted to interdenominational cooperation, because they have become doctrinally indifferent and in not a few instances have cast to the winds, as far as they are concerned, the very fundamentals of Christianity. The latter condition is a very serious one, and we are sorry that an effort to give more religious instruction to the youth of the land, which in itself is laudable, is put into the service of a religion which is headed toward Unitarianism, if it has not already become such. The poor children who are to be brought up in the atmosphere of such a devitalized religion are to be pitied.

Daily lesson outlines are given in the book covering eight years of common school work and three years of high school work. FRITZ.